

THE  
REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

APRIL, 1880.

---

ART. I.—THE COMING OF THE LORD.

*A Scriptural Outline.*

BY REV. TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D. D., ONE OF THE PASTORS OF THE COLLEGIATE DUTCH CHURCH, NEW YORK.

THIS is a phrase which occurs very frequently in the New Testament. In some cases it cannot denote a literal coming. As for example in Matthew x. 23, where the Saviour, in His first instructions to the twelve, said, "When they persecute you in this city flee ye to another, for verily ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come." But they have gone over these cities and our Lord has not come in person. So in Matt. xvi. 28, He said, "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." All these persons died, yet the Lord has not come. Even if, as some suppose, He referred to His transfiguration, that was not a coming, except in a metaphorical sense. Again, in Matt. xxiv. 34, after describing His coming with great power and glory, He said, "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." But the contemporary race (in which sense the word *generation* is always used in classical and in Hellenistic Greek) has passed away, and

still the literal Advent has not occurred. The phrase, therefore, *must* sometimes be used in a figurative sense.

But in the great majority of cases it denotes an actual and visible return of our Lord to earth. When the Master ascended from Olivet, the disciples, straining their eyes to follow His ascending form, were told by two men in white apparel, (who, according to Ewald's brilliant conjecture, were Moses and Elijah, the Founder and the Restorer of the old dispensation,) that this same Jesus, who had been taken up, should "so come in like manner as" they had seen him go into heaven. (Acts i. 11). From this statement the faith of the early church and all the creeds formulated the doctrine of the Second advent. The characteristic features of this Advent are stated in the New Testament clearly and fully.

I. *It will be in Glory.* When Christ first came it was far otherwise. He was a root out of a dry ground. Poverty and obscurity marked His birth. The song of the angels and the visit of the Magi were mere exceptions to the lowness of His surroundings. But when He reappears it is to be in the clouds of heaven, with the voice of an archangel and the trump of God, and followed by the armies of heaven. The theophany on Sinai and the startling vision of Isaiah in the temple are but faint hints of the pomp and majesty which are to attend the return of the Son of Man to the scene of His former humiliation.

II. *The Time of His coming is expressly said to be not only unknown, but unknowable* "Of that day knoweth no man no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Notwithstanding these plain words, attempts have been made in various ages to cast the horoscope of this world's destiny, and determine the precise period when the sign of the Son of Man should appear; but they all signally failed, however wise or learned or devout their authors were. Nor is there any risk in saying that such must always be the result of similar efforts in the future. But while this is true, there are some conditions precedent plainly stated in Scripture. Thus

our Lord said, (Matt. xxiv. 14), "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness to all nations, and then shall the end come." Whether the gospel has been thus proclaimed does not seem to be a difficult matter to decide. A missionary just from Japan says that not more than one in ten of its population have ever heard of the Saviour. And of how large a portion of China, India and inter-tropical Africa is the same true? Further, the Apostle Paul declared to the Thessalonians (II. ii. 3) that the day of the Lord should not come, "except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition," etc. At the time of the Reformation this appalling apostasy was generally supposed to refer to the Papacy, and this view indeed came to be held almost as a dogma among Protestants, but during the present century the judgment of scholars has turned more and more in another direction, holding that "that wicked" is personal, is an individual embodiment of evil, and that he has not yet appeared, at least, in the fulness of the Apostle's meaning. Again in the Epistle to the Romans (xi. 25, 26) we find the inspired author limiting the continuance of the deplorable blindness which rests upon Israel to a fixed period, which is described very definitely by the words, "Until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in;" when he adds, "and so all Israel shall be saved." There may be a question, What is the exact measure of this *pleroma* or fulness, but that it has not yet occurred nor been attended by the promised result as to Israel, seems to be beyond question. And if these three passages are to be understood in their natural sense, the coming of the Lord can hardly be said to be imminent.

III. *The purposes for which Christ is to come are plainly stated.* I. One is to *raise the dead*. The foundation passage on this point is His solemn declaration: (Jno. v. 28, 29.) "The hour is coming in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." Every word in these verses indi-

cates that the rising again of the two classes is simultaneous. In other portions of Scripture emphasis is laid upon the resurrection of the righteous dead, for the obvious reason that to them this event is a matter of joyful hope, while to others it suggests only sadness and terror. Hence our Lord's comforting assurance, "This is the Father's will, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing but raise it up again at the last day." Nothing is said by the sacred writers respecting the nature of the bodies of those who come out of the grave for condemnation, but the blessed character of His reviving power upon His people is often insisted upon, nowhere perhaps more vigorously, and yet concisely, than in the Apostle's statement that when the Lord Jesus comes from heaven, He "shall change our vile body [body of humiliation] that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." (Philip. iii. 21).

A second object of the Lord's return is to *judge the world*. At an early period of His ministry He said, (John v. 22), "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son," and in the vivid prediction at the close of His life (Matt. xxv. 31-46), He described the process and its interminable issues, as taking place "when the Son of Man shall come in his glory." Hence we find repeated references to this dread event in the Epistles; and the assertion of it forms the concluding utterance of the profound and masterly address of Paul at the Areopagus: "He hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised Him from the dead." (Acts xvii. 31). Now it is not necessary to assume that all the various procedures of a human court will be carried through before the great white throne—what need will there be then of witnesses, counsel, etc.?—but it is absolutely necessary, if we deal fairly with the divine word, to hold that there will be a judicial trial and determination of the works and character of every human being. It is not simply such a prolonged, providential dealing with men as is intended in the conclusion of Schiller's fine poem, "The world's

history is the world's judgment," but an actual assize, in which the Lord brings to light the hidden things of darkness, and once for all vindicates His sleepless and immaculate justice.

The third purpose of the Second Advent is involved in the preceding. *It is to deliver and bless His own chosen people.* The "soldiers of an injured king" are often injured themselves. They pass through tribulation. They are put to fiery trials. And when they die, many think that death is to them just what it is to all others. But "that day" will show the difference. The Lord has said that when He comes, "he will send his angels and they shall gather his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Matt. xxiv. 31.) The promise with which He consoled the disciples in the hour of gloom, occasioned by the thought of His approaching departure, was, "If I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself that where I am there ye may be also." (Jno. xiv. 3.) Thus received they find rest, everlasting rest. Such is the peculiar and intimate relation between them and Him that He is called their life, and when He is manifested they also are manifested with Him in glory, for He shall come to be glorified in His saints. His own hand shall put upon their heads the crown of life, His own voice utter the gracious invitation, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

IV. *What are the bearings of the Second Advent upon Christ's people?* They are many, but some are especially prominent. One is that it should be an object of *loving desire*. This is apparent all through the New Testament. The common description of Christians is that they are eagerly awaiting the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ; looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour; looking for and hastening unto (or hastening) the coming of the day of God, etc., etc. They are mentioned as those who "wait for him," who "love his appearing." Why this posture of habitual, earnest, anxious expectation? For the best of all

reasons. The Second Advent is the grand consummation, the great goal to which all things are tending. In one sense a man is saved and has eternal life as soon as he believes. In another sense he is saved only "in hope." The full results of his union to Christ are not and cannot be secured until the Lord comes. Prior to that time the believer is still burdened with the remains of original depravity and the consciousness of indwelling sin. When he dies and goes to be with his Lord, although sin is overcome, he is still destitute of one part of his composite nature. His body is not emancipated from the curse. Only when this is raised and fashioned into a fit vehicle for a spotless soul, is his blessedness and glory complete. Then only is there the full manifestation of the sons of God—that great result which so roused the soul of the Apostle that he represents the entire world with all it contains, animate and inanimate, as anxiously awaiting the long expected deliverance. (Rom. viii. 22.) Still more earnestly do believers yearn for the consummated redemption. All that they enjoy here is only first-fruits, a foretaste of what is to come when their Lord shall appear and they shall be like Him, for they shall see Him as he is. And therefore they look with eager expectations toward that

One far-off divine event  
To which the whole creation moves.

If a believer has no longing for this future blessedness, it must be because he is living far below his privileges or thinks that the Lord is "slack concerning his promise."

Another use of the great truth is *Consolation*. Never since the world began have such comforting words been addressed to a circle of bereaved friends as those which Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, (I. iv. 13,) "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep that ye sorrow not even as the rest which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him." No contrast in all the Scriptures is more striking than the one here stated. Death

always said to the old Pagans, *Lasciate speranza*. No hope, no hope, might justly have been the inscription upon every heathen tomb; but the Gospel bids the mourner amid his tears look for that bright morning when death shall surrender his victims at the call of One who holds the keys of the unseen world, and the saints and the Saviour shall meet to part no more.

Another end of the doctrine is to *promote watchfulness*. This however does not mean that we are to stand on the tiptoe of expectation and gaze up into heaven—the very thing which the two men who stood by the witnesses of the Ascension forbade them to do. But it enjoins the vigilance which keeps one in constant readiness, as appears from our Saviour's illustrations. The servant whose absent master may come unexpectedly is not to sit on the housetop looking for him, but to shun worldly cares and indulgencies, and in this way to be prepared at any and every moment. The virgins who are to await the bridegroom may go to sleep if they see fit, only their lamps must be filled so that at once upon being aroused they can join the joyful procession.

*The virtue of Patience is also taught.* Our Lord has delayed His coming 1800 years already, and no man can positively say that he may not delay it for centuries longer. Scoffers ask now as they did in the days of Peter, "where is the promise of his coming?" And students of physical science often insist that the uniform sequences of nature will continue to hold good in the future, and that it is a mere chimera to expect any abnormal change such as the New Testament foretells. Christians need therefore to obey the injunction, Be patient unto the coming of the Lord. They are not to give way to despondency or unbelief or murmuring, but to wait in calm self-possession, remembering that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day.

Two of the many suggestions the Scripture offers to the impenitent in connection with the Second Advent may be adduced in conclusion. One is given in the way in which the

Saviour enforces the duty of taking up the cross and following Him ; of giving up life, if required, for His sake ; of preferring to lose the whole world rather than one's own soul. These are stringent requirements, but they are sustained by a consideration of overwhelming importance which is thus stated. " For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works." (Matt. xvi. 27.) The other is a caution against abusing the delay of the advent as if it indicated unconcern on God's part or justified recklessness on man's. The reason of the postponement lies simply in the Divine Forbearance. He "is long-suffering, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." (2 Pet. iii. 9.) To pervert this as many do into an excuse for continued unconcern, is simply to persist in evil because God is good.

Nothing has been said in the foregoing of the remarkable statement in Rev. xx. 4-6 about the two resurrections, because there is no mention in any part of that passage of the Lord's coming ; because it occurs in a book confessedly the most mysterious and difficult in all the Scripture ; and because it being an accepted rule in interpretation that the symbolical and obscure is to be explained by the literal and perspicuous, and not *vice versa*, if there be an apparent discrepancy between the Gospels and Epistles on one hand and the Apocalypse on the other, it becomes a true harmonist to modify his exposition of the latter rather than that of the former. And the fact that resurrection is frequently used in a figurative sense in the didactic portion of the New Testament (*e. g.* Jno. v. 25, Colos. iii.), as it had been before in the Old Testament (Is. xxvi. 19, Ezek. xxxvii. 12), renders it anything but strange or unreasonable that the same wondrous exertion of Almighty power should be employed in a similar way in the bold and striking imagery of the Apocalypse.

## ART. II.—TRUTH OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY PROFESSOR E. V. GERHART, D. D.

GRAY's Elegy is not a mathematical demonstration. Of its tender pathos no logic is a competent judge. Shakespeare's Hamlet is not a chapter in history; and the learned researches of the historian do not qualify him to discern the truth of this great tragedy.

Whether or not a proposition in geometry is valid and the process of reasoning by which the truth of the proposition is proved be conclusive, can be determined only on the basis of mathematical principles and by the exercise of a mathematical judgment; not according to the rules of grammar and rhetoric. The proposition is given in language, and stated according to the laws of the English tongue. Yet a man may know the meaning of every word appropriated by a geometrical proposition and criticise the grammatical structure of the sentence, whilst the thought is totally foreign to him and hidden from his perception. The words he may in one respect understand, whilst if he possess no other qualification than such as grammar and rhetoric may furnish, he is utterly incompetent to pass judgment on the thought which the words express.

Every book belongs to a given realm of ideas; and by virtue of this connection with its own realm it is distinctive and peculiar. As the fine arts differ from natural science; an epic poem from a cathedral; Power's Greek Slave from Turner's Slave Ship; and the organism of the human body from the properties of light and water, so does book differ from book. Various books may be written in the same language; and a thorough knowledge of the language is unconditionally a prerequisite to the understanding of each book whatever the realm

to which it belongs. Yet philological learning is not the key that will unlock the truth of Newton's Principia, Plato's Republic, Homer's Iliad or the truth of any great work other than a treatise on philology itself. By common consent no criticism of any classic production can be legitimate and can have authority if it rest on linguistic scholarship only. Poetic taste alone can duly appreciate the genius of Shakespeare. Only a mathematical mind can pass judgment on the alleged discovery of a new formula in the sphere of pure mathematics.

The standard of judgment by which a great work must be measured and estimated is the distinctive realm which the work represents; not the realm peculiar to works of a different class, much less the arbitrary ideal of the critic. The legitimate standard for Milton's Paradise Lost is the ideal of an epic poem, of Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire the conception of history. The ideal of a poem is for Gibbon's Rome a foreign standard. Shakespeare's Macbeth if summoned to justify itself before the court of history would be convicted of error and falsehood.

The Old Testament, consisting of not less than thirty-nine books, is a volume differing from all the best productions of human genius as widely, to say the least, as Virgil's Aeneid differs from the Annals of Tacitus, or Gray's Botany from Blackstone's Commentaries. The sacred scriptures of the Abrahamic nation are not a poem, not a history, not a moral code, not geology or astronomy, much less a work on speculative philosophy. There is in them the peculiar grammatical structure of Hebrew speech, as there is grammatical language in Euclid. They contain much authentic and valuable history, as there are historical facts in Homer's Iliad. The most beautiful poetry, the profoundest philosophy and the purest ethics confront us in their mighty words and are illustrated by their record of events. Yet neither the history nor the morality of the Old Testament, neither its poetry nor its philosophy, neither one nor all together, superior as they may be in themselves, constitute the standard of critical judgment. Nor does the worth of these

sacred books, contemplated under any one of these aspects, constitute their truth; any more than the fidelity of Shakespeare to this or that historical fact or his use of good English constitutes the distinguishing excellence of his tragedies.

Not only does the realm of ideas in which a great work stands furnish the standard of its worth and the touchstone of its truth, but what that realm of ideas is, and what is the legitimate standard of critical judgment, must be ascertained, not from any other sphere of thought, not from books developing other branches of knowledge, but from the work subjected to critical inquiry, and from that alone. Whether Blackstone be natural history, or jurisprudence, or poetry, is determined satisfactorily by a candid study of the author. All testimony for or against this acknowledged authority in law has no force unless it rest on such direct examination of the work itself. In literature this is a general principle, and is universally applied in the criticism of purely human productions. By common consent it is fallacious and absurd to read the history of England in order to ascertain the central idea breathing in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII.* Its motive and aim we must learn from the tragedy itself.

The same law governs a correct judgment concerning the Old Testament. In order to ascertain the realm of truth which the sacred volume professes to represent it becomes every scholar who would proceed consistently with principles of criticism accepted and applied in all other departments of literature, to examine these sacred writings with the same openness of mind and docility of disposition, with which a historian must read Homer or the student of natural light must consider observed phenomena in order to ascertain general laws. As Homer and Herodotus, Gibbon and Shakespeare, Bacon and Kepler, so do the writers of the Old Testament represent a realm of ideas peculiar to themselves, a realm which gives distinctive import and a characteristic tone to its language, to its historical events, its cosmology, its promises and precepts, and to all its doctrines of God and man, of good and evil, of the

supernatural and the natural. No other work can disclose or define that realm, no genius however extraordinary, no philosophy however profound, and no natural science however important and valid its researches. What is the distinctive sphere in which professedly the books of the Old Testament live and move? What agreeably to the Volume itself is the controlling idea that characterizes and animates its language and manifold doctrines?

Turning away from the dicta of natural science and the hypotheses of philosophy, we shall endeavor to find an answer to this inquiry on the basis of the principle acknowledged and asserted in every department of literature. Like all other great books the Old Testament possesses the exclusive right of announcing its own claim. Professing to be, not metaphysical speculation, much less a theory of man and the material universe inferred from phenomena, but a supernatural revelation of Jehovah to His people, we shall briefly consider these sacred writings in the light of their own extraordinary claim: This extraordinary claim is the legitimate criterion of judgment. What is the central idea of the Old Testament as set forth and developed by the writers themselves?

The tabernacle in the wilderness was reared in the centre of the camp of the Israelites, its portal opening towards the rising sun. The tribes pitched their tents all around, three on the east and three on the west, three on the north and three on the south. This tabernacle with its courts, its altars and laver, with its manifold overhangings, its two apartments, its candle-stick and table of shewbread, and the ark enclosing the law engraved on tables of stone guarded by the winged cherubim, was a symbolical world; to the eye of sense rich and beautiful, but to the common understanding unmeaning. And this elaborate structure must ever be unmeaning to one who does not recognize the fact that it was made after the pattern showed to Moses in the mount. He who accosted the chosen deliverer in the burning bush, and spake to him in the thunders and lightnings of Mount Sinai, He commanded this rich

symbolical tent to be built for His own habitation among His people. As He spake amid flames of fire in the bush, and amid flashes of lightning on Mount Horeb, so was it His will to manifest His presence as the Jehovah of Abraham, and the Redeemer of Abraham's seed from bondage, in the mysterious Shekinah, the fiery pillar which stood over the ark between the cherubim. The presence of Jehovah with His people in the Shekinah was the chief significance of that exact and gorgeous work of art, the centre truth of the Mosaic ritual, and of all the wonders wrought in the exodus of the chosen people.

The Tabernacle and the volume of sacred books written by chosen men of the Abrahamic nation, have been cast in the same spiritual mould. This wonderful volume has numberless connections with pagan nations, with pagan history, with pagan ideas of God, with pagan worship and art. It bears on its surface the impressions of geography, of political revolutions, national convulsions, even of bloody wars, and the vices and crimes of individuals. The natural and human may be seen in every book and chapter, in every word and syllable. But the meaning is not in battles or the plagues of Egypt, not in visible wonders, not in historical associations with surrounding nationalities, not in the peculiar organization of the Semitic dialects; although it be true that the spiritual is robed in the natural, and divine grace expresses its riches in the articulate sounds of human speech.

The tabernacle was built of earthly material. Wood from the forest; gold and silver from distant mines; precious stones from the waters; skins from the wild beasts of the desert; costly fabrics woven from the fibre of the plant and the wool of the sheep; marble from the quarry and water from the fountain:—all wrought into a structure of beauty and splendor by the skill of man. The tent stood in the centre of the camp, visible to the bodily eye, and was at will taken down and set up by human hands. But the meaning of the tent was not in curtains, nor in the brazen laver; not in the gold and silver and precious stones; not even in the significant proportions of

the two compartments ; nay more, not in what might by the bodily eye be seen of the fiery pillar between the cherubim. The meaning of the tabernacle was not in any one of these earthly and natural materials, nor in all combined. A scientific Bedouin might have studied the whole structure with much care and thoroughness, and yet have remained totally ignorant of the tabernacle. He might have examined the solid material, and by certain marks have decided the species of the wood, and the quality of the marble, and by unerring induction have determined from what places these materials were taken. Another, a skilful artisan, might have observed the texture of the fabrics. By unmistakable marks he might have inferred from what variety or sex of goat the hair was taken, or what species of sheep furnished the fine wool. Still another might have investigated the quality of the workmanship and the artistic decorations ; and then might have inferred some general scientific facts. He might have determined what elements were due to Egyptian art, and what due to Assyrian art ; and have described very definitely all the variations from both. Aliens might thus acquire a great deal of correct knowledge respecting the tabernacle, and claim for such knowledge the dignity of science.

But of what worth comparatively would such knowledge be ? However various and extensive, however definite and correct it might be, would such external and natural knowledge afford an insight into the true meaning and design of the tabernacle ? After long and patient researches conducted exclusively on the basis of such externalities, would not the most learned man be just as ignorant of the tabernacle, and be just as incompetent to pass a trustworthy judgment respecting the divine significance of the tabernacle as if he knew nothing of the quality of the natural materials, or the characteristics of Assyrian and Egyptian art ?

In like manner the books of the Old Testament may be studied on the basis of such scientific principles. One man may study the Hebrew language and its cognate dialects. He

may, for example, discover in the Book of Genesis distinct traces of an earlier and a later hand, the Elohist and the Jehovah. His philological acumen might even enable him to disentangle the two productions, as now constructed, assigning to each one his own part of the Book. He might go further, and trace the growth of the Hebrew tongue through a succession of ages, noting the specific differences of every period, and delineating the modifying influences of the Semitic languages at different epochs in the history of the Hebrews; and thus be able to account for variation in the usage of words and differences of style. Natural genius may in this way enable him to draw a picture of the interior process of the Hebrew tongue and all its subtle relations and connections. The result would be a monument of vast philological learning and profound scholarship. Another might investigate the geography, or botany and zoology, or the political history incorporated into the Old Testament. He might describe the connection of the Abrahamic nation with the Canaanites, the Egyptians, the Assyrians, and the nomadic tribes of the desert; and describe this connection as it varies from age to age in the progress of the development of the chosen nation. We would thus get a scientific history of the Hebrew commonwealth. Still another might examine the time, place, and the external circumstances of every book, and determine when, where, and by whom these books were successively written. He would learn as far as possible the occasion of these writings, and detect the peculiar coloring which this and that passage receives from social customs, from historical occurrences, political upheavals, civil convulsions, and the like.

Such philological and historical knowledge possesses interest and great value. Language merits patient research. The more learning the Christian may acquire the better. But however trustworthy the result of such scientific research, it is not the light of the Old Testament. It is not what may in any proper sense be called the truth of these sacred books. Like the scientific study of the external materials and the artistic work-

manship of the tabernacle in the wilderness, the investigation of the linguistic and historical aspects of the Jewish Scriptures can issue only in the perception of what is human and natural. The natural is indeed a constituent of the Old Testament economy, as of the tabernacle so also of its sacred literature. But if the sacred literature claims as it does to be the word of Jehovah as the tabernacle professes to have been built after the pattern shown to Moses in the Mount, then the natural, actual and important as it is, can be no more than the incidental drapery of the spiritual and the heavenly; and no scientific knowledge of the Hebrew tongue can by itself give the Biblical scholar an insight into the spiritual truth of the written Word, any more than thorough acquaintance with Assyrian and Egyptian art can by itself afford the scientific artist an insight into the supernatural significance of the tabernacle.

Of the tabernacle and of Solomon's temple the central light was the visible Shekinah; yet not the shape, and the external presence of the luminous pillar of the cloud, but the presence of Jehovah invisible to the bodily eye. The invisible presence, discerned only by the eye of faith, was the truth of the visible Shekinah. So is Jehovah the central light of the Old Testament Scriptures. Not the doctrine of God as the former and upholder of heaven and earth; nor as the moral Governor of the world. Such doctrine the Old Testament certainly teaches. But the central light is not a proposition respecting the Creator and His relations to His creatures. Jehovah is Himself this central light, that is, Jehovah living in covenant fellowship with His chosen people. As a father lives among his children; as the children and the father are members of an earthly household; so did Jehovah live in the midst of the Abrahamic nation; they and He being the members of the same spiritual economy on earth. Jehovah reveals His presence in word and deed; His people hear His word and all His mighty acts. Jehovah utters His commandments; His people obey and receive His blessing, or disobey and are punished. Jehovah is the object of worship; His people approach Him by offering

sacrifices and observing all the ceremonies of the law. Jehovah forgives the sins of those who turn to Him with penitent hearts and forsake the ways of unrighteousness ; His people receive His mercy and rejoice in the light of His countenance. Jehovah, speaking by the prophets, announces a more intimate presence and closer fellowship, richer blessings and a more extensive dominion through One that is to come ; His people believe the promise, they hope and pray, they wait and long for its fulfillment.

Jehovah is Himself the One who came, as the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and He is likewise the One who was to come in the fulness of time. Jehovah lives in a peculiar fellowship with the children of Israel, different from His communion with other nations ; and He will live with His people in a fellowship still more real and intimate. Jehovah is manifesting Himself as long-suffering and gracious, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin ; but in the Coming One He will manifest Himself as making true and final atonement for sin and overcoming the power of death.

It is this spiritual fact, the presence and fellowship of Jehovah with men, first in the patriarchal line from Seth to Noah, from Noah to Abraham, and then in the posterity of Abraham, which is central in the Old Testament. Jehovah manifesting Himself in deeds and by promise, Jehovah who has come, and is ever coming to His chosen people and in them, and who will come in the boundless fulness of His love and grace in the Son of Man, the seed of Abraham and the offspring of David,—this divine mystery is the idea which, like the Shekinah of the tabernacle, is the interior light illumining with ever increasing splendor the Holy of Holies of the Old Testament Scriptures.

In this central truth of the Old Testament two factors meet. The one is divine, the other human. The coming One is the Son of Man. In the earliest record He is announced as the seed of the woman. It is written: “I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed ; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” He shall

be one of the posterity of the first human pair. This idea runs through all the sacred books. Addressing Abraham, Jehovah says : " I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great ; and thou shalt be a blessing : And I will bless them that bless thee and curse him that curseth thee : and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." The same word of promise is renewed to his grand-son Jacob : " I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac : the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed. And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth ; and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south ; and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." The evident meaning of this Scripture is, that the blessing of Jehovah shall come upon the nations of the earth in and through a lineal descendant of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The same prophecy is presented still more definitely in the revelation of Jehovah to Moses. It is written : " The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me ; unto him ye shall hearken." Every writer is imbued with the hope inspired by the promise of a coming Messiah ; and nearly every one presents the Messianic hope under a new aspect. The seed of Abraham and the prophet like unto Moses becomes the son of David, and the child of the virgin. Waiving further citations, we may with confidence emphasize the undoubted fact that the belief of the chosen people in their promised king and deliverer was a belief in One who like themselves would be truly human, born of a woman, flesh of their flesh, a member of their own nation.

But the conception of a great man, a prophet of the Lord, a mighty hero and king, is not by itself commensurate with the Messianic idea of the Old Testament. There is another line of teaching running through all these books which has a contrary meaning. Just as explicitly does the Old Testament teach that the coming One will be other than man. The promise is that Jehovah Himself will come unto His people, and dwell among

them. We quote several passages from the Pentateuch : "I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God" (Ex. xxix. 45). "I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people" (Lev. xxvi. 12). "Defile not therefore the land which ye shall inhabit, wherein I dwell: for I the Lord dwell among the children of Israel" (Num. xxxv. 34). These and other utterances of the same import doubtless refer to the time then being, and to the manner of the presence of Jehovah in the Shekinah, and in the cultus of the Theocratic nation. But all such teaching emphasizes the supernatural verity that it is *Jehovah* Himself who dwells and will perpetually dwell on earth in the spiritual communion of His people.

This doctrine of the Pentateuch is the key-note in the writings subsequent to the time of Moses. It sounds in every epoch and amid all the vicissitudes of Israel's eventful history. Consider the words spoken in the books of Samuel and the Kings. Nathan says to David, speaking in the name of Jehovah: "I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father and he shall be my son. \*

\* \* And thy house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee: thy throne shall be established forever." (2 Sam. vii. 12-16). "And the word of the Lord came to Solomon, saying, Concerning this house which thou art building, if thou wilt walk in my statutes and execute my judgments, and keep all my commandments to walk in them; then will I perform my word with thee, which I spoke unto David thy father: And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will not forsake my people Israel." (1 Kings vi. 11-13). Jehovah will dwell in the temple built by Solomon on Mt. Moriah as He dwelt in the tabernacle built by Moses in the wilderness. The presence of Jehovah will be as the presence of a father with his children. The promise concerning the Davidian dynasty doubtless means that the descendants of David will from generation to generation occupy the throne of the Abrahamic

nation. But the promise has a meaning deeper than the external and historical. This deeper spiritual sense, as discerned by David in the Psalms, and interpreted by the New Testament, is the coming One, the Son of David who should establish an everlasting dominion among men.

The doctrine of Jehovah coming to His people and dwelling among them is heard with special distinctness among the Prophets in and after the age of Samuel. We present but a few quotations. Saith the Lord: "And ye shall be my people, and I will be your God," (Jer. xxx. 22). "I am a father to Israel and Ephraim is my first-born." (Jer. xxxi. 9). "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord: But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people." (Jer. xxxi. 31-33). "O Zion that bringest good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain; O Jerusalem that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah Behold your God! Behold, the Lord God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him; behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him. He shall feed his flock like a shepherd; he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young." (Isa. xl. 9-11). "Thus saith the Lord of hosts: Behold, I will save my people from the east country, and from the west country; and I will bring them and they shall dwell in the midst of Jerusalem; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God, in truth and in righteousness." (Zech. viii. 7, 8). Let these few citations stand as exponents of the general tenor of the teachings of the Old Testament prophets.

Many more might be given, filled with the same idea, that Jehovah dwells among His people, and will dwell among them to bless them with temporal and spiritual blessings.

In regard to those passages from the Prophets and others which we forbear to quote, we repeat the remarks already made, that they doubtless refer to events taking place in the actual history of the Abrahamic people; but in these events supernatural and divine agency is present and active. The spiritual fact confronting faith is doubtless this, that God Himself is with His people, and with them perpetually, and under a future dispensation will come to them with new grace and new glory.

The two-fold central idea of the Old Testament, that the Messiah is on the one hand the Seed of Abraham, and on the other, the Lord God Himself, comes prominently to view in the Psalms of David. Agreeably to the Second Psalm, the Coming One is David's Son: "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." David, the seed of Abraham, and typifying the coming seed, is the Son of Jehovah. Jehovah is His Father. Moreover David recognizes the coming seed of Abraham as His Lord. He says: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." (Ps. cx. 1). We have the import of this passage given by Jesus Himself, when He says to the Jews: "What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, the son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord?" According to the teaching of Christ, David sees in the promised Messiah, One who is the lineal descendant of his own family, and One who is at the same time also David's Lord.

The human factor and the divine factor in the central idea of the Old Testament Scriptures are commonly set forth in different passages; one line of faith and prophecy emphasizing the human, and another line of faith and prophecy emphasizing the divine. But there are not a few passages which unite

these different factors in the same prophetic utterance. We select but one from the prophecy of Isaiah: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." (Isa. ix. 6).

We have given these citations to illustrate the general tenor of the explicit teaching of the books of the Old Testament as interpreted by our Lord and His disciples. But we are not limited to what is directly set forth in words. The central idea is central in all the events of Old Testament history, central in the wonderful dealings of Jehovah with Abraham and his posterity, and central in the sacrifices and other ceremonies of the Mosaic economy. If we read these sacred books with a spiritual eye, recognizing the supernatural claim that this volume is the Word of God, we can see the presence and operation of the two-fold idea in every interposition and revelation of Almighty God. The scope of our inquiry does not permit us to note particulars in detail. We shall use but one illustration, the Abrahamic covenant itself. That covenant is the gracious fellowship of Jehovah with Abraham and his posterity, and the responsive fellowship of Abraham with Jehovah. The covenant has two terms: Jehovah and Abraham, God and man. Jehovah is the God of Abraham; and Abraham is the man of God. Jehovah is the God of the Abrahamic nation; and the Abrahamic nation are the chosen people of Jehovah. The covenant is a covenant of God with man, of man with God; that is, a God-man covenant. The interior energy and distinctive law of the chosen nation is thus a divine-human principle.

What is this extraordinary God-man covenant, this divine-human fellowship, but the light and power of the coming One? What is the tabernacle but a figure of the union of the heavenly and the earthly? Not an empty figure, but a figure informed by the spiritual fact itself. What is the entire ceremonial law but a prophet and a school-master unto Christ? as St. Paul calls it. The law in its entire cultus foreshadowed and taught

the Christ. The tabernacle and the Mosaic ritual were the fellowship of Jehovah with His people. Not, indeed, the personal Christ; nor the veritable incarnation of God, but the Messiah, the coming One, was the true meaning, and the spiritual power of the covenant and the Mosaic ritual. The great principle that wrought in the covenant cultus was ever Immanuel, God with us.

Taking this view of the Abrahamic covenant, and recognizing the ceremonial law in its profoundest sense as a school-master unto Christ, we can see the solar light radiated from every wonderful phenomenon. What is the burning bush but the Messianic idea, the supernatural in the natural? What was the deliverance of the chosen people from the bondage of Egypt, but the presence and might of the coming One delivering His people from evil? What is Mount Sinai, but a manifestation of the same Messianic vision? the majesty of Jehovah present to teach and deliver His people, and the response of faith on the part of Moses. What was the pillar of a cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night but the declaration of the same two-fold fundamental principle, Jehovah guiding and protecting His people whilst His people follow His guidance, and confide in His protection? What moreover are the six days of Genesis but a constructive movement rising from lower to higher types of existence, in which, at every epoch, are inwrought two factors, the one heavenly, the other cosmical, the one divine and creative, the other human and natural—a process reaching its climax in a self-conscious autonomy, man, who being the archetype of all material forms, from chaos onward, is also the living image of the personal God, thus constituting the creaturely basis and the prophecy of Messianic revelation?

That the Messianic idea is the solar light of the Old Testament is taught directly and unequivocally by the writers of the New Testament. Christ and His kingdom are presented as the true issue and spiritual end of the ceremonial law. Our Lord teaches that Moses and the prophets wrote of Him; and all that is written in the law and by the prophets must be fulfilled.

Matthew, Mark and Luke habitually refer to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and assert that Jesus of Nazareth has fulfilled what in them is written. St. John is no exception, though his references to Scripture are less frequent. The first sermon after our Lord's ascension, preached on the day of Pentecost by St. Peter, is throughout based on the Messianic idea pervading the prophets. The outpouring of the Holy Ghost by Christ exalted to the right hand of God, fulfils the predictions uttered by the prophet Joel. The other sermons of Peter, recorded in Acts, are just as explicit. Indeed the question at issue between the Apostles and the unbelieving Jews was none other than this: Whether Jesus of Nazareth was the coming One, the promised king of the Jews? Whether He was the One whom the tabernacle prefigured, the ceremonies of the law foreshadowed, and the writings of the prophets announced? The Jews rejected Jesus, not because there was no Messianic idea in the Old Testament, not because they did not firmly believe in the coming of the Christ of God, but because as they interpreted the law and the prophets, Jesus of Nazareth was not that Christ.

The Apostles, on the contrary, whilst of one mind with unbelieving Jews that the Messianic hope was central in the Old Testament, differed from them in that they believed that Jesus of Nazareth was the One who truly and in all respects fulfils the Word of Jehovah written in the Scriptures. This common faith regarding the expected Christ becomes thus the pivot of every controversy and of every conflict; and divides the whole Jewish nation into believers and unbelievers. The issue meets us in every book of the New Testament, if not in every chapter. It is just as prominent in the writings of St. Paul as in those of St. Peter.

In the epistles of St. Paul several passages occur where he interprets the words and events of Old Testament history as signifying Jesus, the Christ. He says: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made: He saith not, and to seeds as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ."

(Gal. iii. 16.) St. Paul interprets the promise of Jehovah to Abraham and his Seed to be the promise of Jehovah to Christ: The scriptural meaning of Abraham and his posterity was the Coming One who in the fulness of time was manifest in Jesus of Nazareth. Of like kind is the significance seen by St. Paul in the rock smitten by Moses. "All our fathers were under the cloud and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ." (1 Cor. x: 1-4). In the natural manna Paul sees spiritual bread; in the natural water, spiritual drink; in the external rock, the living Rock, the foundation of the chosen people and the fountain of their spiritual life, that is, Christ.

Indeed it is the luminous teaching of the New Testament that qualifies us to see the Messianic idea in the Jewish Scriptures with a clearness and fulness unknown to Moses and the prophets. Whilst the Christ of God was under some aspect of His ineffable fulness figured in every leading fact, and wrought in every positive intuition of Moses, and touched the hearts of the people in every word of Jehovah, He was by Abraham and the patriarchs, by Moses and the prophets, when their perception is compared with the clear vision of the Apostles, but faintly discerned. By very many of the Israelites in every age the Christ was not even discerned at all. A veil of spiritual ignorance blinded their minds, so that when they read the law and observed its requirements the prophetic meaning of the law was hidden. Even unto this day, as St. Paul writes of the unbelieving Jews, when Moses is read the veil is upon their heart. This charge of spiritual blindness involves the same Messianic truth. The minds of the unbelieving Jews were blinded, blinded inasmuch as they did not discern in the law, read from day to day in the synagogue, the Christ of God. The Christ was there; He shone as the central light of the law: but the veil of blindness was upon their hearts.

Thus the books of the New Testament concur with the books of the Old Testament in proclaiming unequivocally the same

doctrine that the Seed of Abraham, the coming Jehovah, the Christ of God is the solar light of the pre-christian Scriptures. We see there the fact of the fall, the bondage of the Israelites in Egypt; we have the Decalogue, and the ceremonial law; we have miracles and prophecies, precious promises and fearful threatenings; but all these manifestations are harmonious with truth by virtue of their internal connection with one divine principle. The light of this principle authenticates its presence and power in and through all the persons, all the events, and all the words of the Old Testament.

Who then can read the books of the Old Testament, and grasp their real meaning? Claiming to be the Word of the Lord God, who can hear the Word and know what he hears? Who may be at heart convinced that these ancient Scriptures proclaim a divine revelation? To whom can the purport of Old Testament facts and words, the substance of every institution and rite, of every precept and promise, every miracle and prophecy, authenticate itself as divine truth? Can he discern this Truth, who assumes that the Old Testament is only a system of law and precept: on the one side stern authority, and on the other external subjection? Or can he, who recognizes but empty types and shadows? Or can he, who sees in these books merely the product of the natural religious life of a branch of the Semitic family? Or can he, who nowhere acknowledges anything higher and better than natural phenomena and their scientific classification?

Is it not self-evident that the inquirer who approaches the Old Testament under the controlling influence of a radically false presumption respecting the interior principle of all its teaching, will fail to see the light of that principle? And if he fails to see the solar light of that interior principle, can he behold the illumination of that light in any person or event, in any institution or fact of the Old Testament? If he has no eye to discern the Christ of God in persons and events, in institutions, commands and promises, how can the true significance of any person, or word or law authenticate itself to his con-

sciousness, even though he concedes that particular men, like Abraham, Moses and David, and particular institutions, like the tabernacle and the priesthood, are historical realities?

If the Scriptures of the Old Testament are pervaded, as they claim, by the spiritual power of a divine-human idea; and if the meaning of all its parts is vitally connected with that idea; then certainly only that man can see the unity and spiritual significance of these Scriptures who recognizes in them the presence and controlling influence of the Christ of God. And every one who denies that the divine-human Christ of God is the central idea of these Scriptures, in other words, all who read and study these ancient books on any other presumption than that which they assert on their own behalf, cannot but be blind to the significance of the whole volume as of all its parts; just as those who deny the axioms of quantity or have no power to grasp their logical connections with mathematical processes, must be incapable of seeing the validity of any mathematical demonstration.

The man who assumes that Christianity is, in kind, identical with all other religions, but differs from them only in degree of excellence, will most likely see in the Hebrew Scriptures the best result of man's natural religious aspirations. In them he may find one personal God, an all wise Providence, and the propriety of worship. He may read there the great ideas ruling in the development of ethnic religions. To his mind errors and superstitions are by these Scriptures dissipated, and a religion answerable to the dictates of reason taught with simplicity and power. Reading the Old Testament with the natural religious eye only, he may behold some of its presuppositions, but he will not see the new spiritual Truth luminous in its pages. A better religion than man has ever projected he may recognize, but not the Messianic idea. He does not see the Son of God coming in the history of Abraham's seed; nor the propitiation for sin in the ceremonial law. To him the Old Testament may even be a most excellent book yet the glory of its institutions and prophecies is hidden from

him. The volume does not and cannot bear testimony of itself; and for the reason that he has no eye to see the true and faithful witness.

This true and faithful witness is the source of all the rays of spiritual light reflected from innumerable events, precepts, promises, hopes and fears, confronting us in these sacred records. The man who surveys the massive walls and entering the outer courts, passes on to the inner court, and whilst fixing his eyes on the exterior workmanship, catches a glimpse of the golden altar, may be riveted by a sense of the beautiful, and admire with wonder the gorgeous wealth of this ancient temple; but he who ascends to the holy place and moving onward through the veil into the Holy of Holies, beholds with open face the marvelous Shekinah between the cherubim, will worship and adore.

Between divine revelation and natural science the controversy has commonly been conducted both by theologians and physicists on the silent presumption that the contradictions of science are fatal to the authority of the Old Testament, and therefore in order that the Old Testament may continue to command the confidence of mankind there must be a reconciliation between these two realms of ideas, and the reconciliation, to be valid and satisfying to reason, must be effected from the standpoint of science. Natural science has been erected into a court of inquisition; and to this court has been conceded the prerogative of jurisdiction over things spiritual and divine, as well as over things natural and material. The Old Testament is summoned to answer for itself, like the *Novum Organon* of Bacon, before the bar of the common understanding, as if, like Bacon or Newton, the Sacred Writers profess to teach the laws and processes of the material world contemplated from a point of observation exclusively human.

Of apologies for the truth of revelation the principal error has been a tacit concession to such arrogant umpireship. To science in its own sphere, theology must accord all the rights which the progress of investigation justify it in asserting. Its

discoveries are valuable : and the legitimate inferences authorized by these discoveries are to be recognized and appropriated. But the Old Testament is not Science. It does not catalogue external facts ; nor from facts infer the laws and processes of nature, nor teach a doctrine of man's origin suggested by phenomena observed by the bodily eye. Neither is Science revelation. Professedly it moves in a sphere totally different from that of the Old Testament. Each has its own realm. Revelation does not pretend to anticipate or criticise the progress of knowledge as regards the natural history of the earth or of the human race ; nor does it furnish a criterion by which a theory of nature viewed under its external aspects is to be judged. So on the other hand, natural science, to say the very least, can not establish a criterion of validity respecting the doctrines of the Old Testament. When the scientist, from his own point of view, passes judgment on the Cosmology of Genesis, he not only contradicts the antecedent presumption on which Genesis is conceived and written, but contradicts also a fundamental principle admitted relatively to every great work in literature ; for by common consent a book may be understood, appreciated and judged in relation only to its own realm of ideas and by the standard of criticism which itself furnishes.

That no advocates of the truth of the Old Testament have been able as yet to justify the cosmology of Genesis at the bar of this foreign court is a legitimate result, and an indirect witness to the independent authority of the sacred record. Scientific questions alone come within the jurisdiction of a scientific court. If before the judge sitting on this bench, the cosmology of Genesis could justify its conceptions so successfully as from his lips to constrain a verdict of approval, Genesis would no longer be an integral part of the Old Testament. Such a justification of Scripture would contradict its own antecedent presumption. It would show that Genesis was not, like all other canonical portions of the Old Testament, written from the standpoint of the Messianic idea, but written under the guidance of a merely human apprehension of the

mysterious processes resulting in the existing status of the Cosmos. That the strenuous efforts made by mistaken zeal to vindicate the truth of revelation on the basis of natural science have failed to satisfy the minds of scientists, and that among Christian theologians the sentiment has gradually been gaining strength, that from a scientific point of observation a reconciliation is impracticable, serves to demonstrate, not that Genesis is unworthy of rational belief, but that by man's observations it was not inspired, and that by the intuitions and reflections of the human mind its pictorial language was not dictated. So far forth the failure of attempts at reconciliation vindicates the claim of the Old Testament to be, not a book of man but the Word of God. The seeming defeat is an actual victory.

Whether on the basis of an idea other than that suggested by the knowledge of material phenomena a reconciliation between the central truth of the Old Testament and legitimate inferences from natural history is possible, and how such a reconciliation may be effected, are questions that do not fall within the scope of this article. Christian scholarship should feel assured that the suspense does not touch the objective warrant for faith in Holy Scripture. Niebuhr's History of Rome can neither attest nor assail the poetic truth of Shakespeare's Julius Cæsar.

## ART. III.—THE EVIDENCES OF THE SOUL'S EXISTENCE.

BY REV. ALLEN TRAVER, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

WHEN we contemplate the subject of human life and experience, we compare it to a dream, a vision. And when there arises suddenly some agitating or painful event, we are led for the moment to doubt the reality of the occurrence, and to inquire, is not this a dream, a horrid delusion, and not a part of our valid experience.

The phenomenon of dreaming with more than a wizard's deceptive art, mimics our waking experience with such exactness, that however strange and monstrous a dream may be, we do not, while subject to the enchantment, doubt its reality. The mind being in a state of passive repose during sleep; and destitute of power for the time of examining and repelling the delusion, we accept it as real.

And as we have the lively and realizing pleasure when we awake, that the torturing vision was only an unsubstantial dream; and as sober, daily realities sometimes seem as strange as the vision that proved only a phantom of the mind, the possibility is suggested, that our waking experience may in like manner prove deceitful, and that that which we deem the thinking agent, and the objects therein represented, through the avenues of the senses, may be counterfeit, and unreal, and as unstable as the shifting clouds that are piled in the heavens.

If the objects of nature, as recognized by the senses, are sometimes deceptive, and if theorists may question the reality of the material world, or some of its forms, the intellectual speculator may and will raise the question, are we certain that this is a world of souls, and is there a spiritual nature dwelling in the human body? If the basis of native faith has been un-

settled by vicious reasonings, our faith in all those primary truths which are the basis of human knowledge, and the guide of practical life, may become clouded with fatal doubts. Following this initiatory process, there has not been an article of human belief unassailed. The reality of nature, man, and God have been denied, and men have questioned the reality of the thinking principle, strange and paradoxical though it may appear. When universal doubt enters, nothing remains unquestioned. Hence men have averred that there was no positive evidence that the thinking principle was anything more than a succession of rapidly fleeing ideas, and phenomena, each one known only at the instant of manifestation, and then fading away, and leaving no trace of itself, positively recognizable, and assuring us that our anticipations of the future were not well-founded.

The conclusion then would follow, that there may be not only the denial of all positive belief, but a universal distrust of the results attained by the intellectual faculties, which are employed in the acquisition of truth. But these views are to be rejected as the result of false modes of reasoning based on universal doubt. There is positive truth; and there is universal belief, which is the voice of humanity, and this is invincible. Not only is there truth, but there is in man a nature adequate to its discovery, and this, nature proclaims with a living power.

We begin the activity of our rational life with the perceptions of the senses, with self-consciousness, and with the intuitions of the reason. These give us the reality of matter and mind, form and spirit. We soon begin to reason from effect to cause, and from cause to effect, and by this means our faith in the existence of God, as taught in revelation, is confirmed. Thus the mind starts in its intelligent acts of reasoning with knowledge. Advancing from this point, we attain those convictions which are the basis of a living faith. The soul moves forward in the line of truth, fed and nurtured by knowledge, its faith fortified and confirmed, and thus attains development,

growth, and culture, and a measure of perfection. (a.) We act on the conviction that there is the outward world of nature, and that matter is real, and the testimony on which we rely is sense-perception. This is the first truth in the study of nature, and lies at the foundation of all inquiries in this department. (b.) The first truth in theology is that there is a God, who created the universe, and the soul of man, and that He sustains and preserves all things, and that He is the benefactor of His creatures. There is no attempt made in our sacred Books to prove the reality of the divine existence. It is an assumed truth coupled with the assertion that the fool hath said in his heart there is no God. There are logical processes by which we reach the same conclusions, but independent of truth, there is the primary belief, the universal conviction of the existence of God. (c.) The existence of man as a soul, dwelling in a body prepared for it, is the first truth of human philosophy. This soul is not a mere seeming, but a reality, and the conviction rests on a definite and well-founded basis. It is a universal conviction. We have always believed it. No one ever attempts to argue us into the belief that this is an absolute fact, yet we believe it with a depth of conviction equal to the measure of our nature. We were not argued into it in our early years, but the conviction was spontaneous with our individuality, personality and life, and with the development of consciousness, our faith was deepened. If we ever had a doubt whether there are souls, it was a question of the speculative intellect, and not the result of intuition or reasoning. Most works on mental philosophy begin with the assumption, and treat it as a truth unquestioned by the majority of men. They do not as a rule descend to the arena for the discussion of the subject, but regard the fact as one that is based on the highest reason. There is in circulation and use among men, a vast amount of what may be termed unscientific truth. No one calls it in question, when the highest earthly interests turn on it.

It is the result of the fragmentary experience and observation of mankind, and flows from feelings and convictions which

have grown out of the undefined, but acknowledged instincts of humanity. One of these is the existence of the soul, for the majority of men do not consider and determine it as the first truth in the philosophy of spirit.

But we may argue the case and present the reason, and thus show how we hold this first truth of the spiritual, and the mode of establishing the theory by valid arguments which satisfy the reason. A theory if seen in its own light is self-evident, and then the ground of it is revealed by the processes of the intellect. Such is the constitution of things that we must exercise positive belief.

And there is not a living, rational man who does not believe in the reality of the soul. The most thorough sceptic on earth, who listens to utterances from the pulpit, the bar, the hall wherein the wronged seek justice, and from the mouth of the physician in the sick-room, believes some assertions, though he may pretend to deny the existence of God, and the reality of the soul and human accountability.

If he doubts, that doubt is a reality, and exists in a real soul, whatever may be its nature. Hence man is assured of the existence of an intelligent agent, which he calls the soul. "The natural and healthy state of the human mind is one of belief. We intuitively give credit to our senses, our memory, our reason, our moral sentiments; and ere distrust in any of them is experienced, a considerable process of thinking and of reasoning must have passed through the intellect.

Ordinarily speaking, men have neither the leisure, nor the taste to sit down and investigate the foundations of knowledge, and consequently they give themselves up without any hesitation to their natural and intuitive beliefs." The reality of the soul, and the truthfulness of our mental constitution are granted by all who are not spiritually vitiated with sin, and the unbelief flowing from sin in the soul, reversing all orderly and wise action and growth.

If the question is proposed, why do you argue against such an irrational position, or present principles on which belief can

be established, that we are souls, when there is no basis for doubt that is really sound, and when those who cavil have no rest, and are as unstable as the sands of the desert, I reply, because men will and do make an irrational use of reason and perish from doubt. We wish to remove the very foundation of their position, so that there is not even a pretext for erroneous reasoning, or for doing or thinking evil, or for indifference to the welfare of the soul, so fearfully involved in evil.

For it is a sad truth that there are partially cultivated minds who have not sufficient depth and breadth of knowledge or mental acumen to discover the destructive tendency and power of doubt. In the crudeness and verdancy of their speculations they grasp the notion of the universal uncertainty of all human knowledge, and aver that all is involved in more or less doubt. They urge this in opposition to the truths of the finite spirit, and to the reality of the existence of the Infinite Spirit.

They oppose or are indifferent to all that is great and good in morals, philosophy, and religion. He who loses confidence in the reality of certain, and instinctive, and universal truths, who doubts the powers of the soul, does a wrong to every department of science and truth. He cuts the nerves of exertion, and represses inquiry. He fosters a form of contempt for the systematic prosecution of the mines of knowledge that are opened. He weakens the ties of moral obligation. He conducts men to the paths of degeneracy, rather than those that lead to the attainment of the true, the beautiful and good.

The evidences of the soul's existence are too deeply seated in human nature, to have their sum materially increased or diminished by the power of argument drawn from rules of reason, or developed by logical processes. It is not amiss, however, as an intellectual discipline to require and use arguments for the establishment of the principle on which this faith rests, and to defend the position by a consideration of the principles of reasoning. No one clings to the belief of the soul's being as the result of such an argument. We are born with the knowledge of belief. An able theorist will give many pointed and cogent

reasons founded on natural laws, and the social principles of the race, why we should cherish love for parents and kindred. But we know also that we have loved them from the spring and promptings of a holier and deeper inward impulse than mere intellectual arguments can produce.

Having faith in many truths before reason examines them, we still inspect this faith, and do not regard it above the claims of examination. The leadings of this faith we regard as upwards, but it requires weights to balance and adjust it, lest it soar on the airy wing of unguided fancy, or be wrecked in its flight by a misguided imagination. Our constitutional beliefs can be tested, and we can judge when they are valid and should be allowed, and when not allowed to flow freely and lead us on.

When intellectual conviction is secured, followed by a living belief, we can test it by the following inquiries : (a.) Is it self-evident, and adapted to convict men of its truth, by an instinctive appeal to man's nature ? (b.) Is it so absolute in its necessity that we cannot believe the opposite ? (c.) Is it universal ? With these tests, we may avoid mistaking our fancies, and wishes, and imaginings, and prejudices, for primitive and heaven-born beliefs. At the same time we can justify ourselves in appealing to the convictions and faiths which have the most solemn sanction of our intellectual and spiritual constitution, and in using them as a basis on which to rear the grand, harmonious and matchless temple of truth.

2D. By tracing certain mental attributes, and powers, and phenomena to their central source and germ-life, we find the soul.

It has been argued by some of the princes of doubters that we have no knowledge in self-consciousness of reality beyond the mere idea or impression ; a phenomenon in the sense of appearance ; or of a mere quality or attribute of some unknown object or thing. But ideas, impressions, or appearances, qualities and attributes inhere and centre in some reality. "No account which falls short of this can be regarded as a full exhi-

bition of the facts falling under our eye when we look within." There are certain moral, intellectual and spiritual phenomena open and exposed to our observation. These find a center in the consciousness of man, and glow in that central orb.

It may seem a servile work to observe the simple facts of matter and mind, and to bring them into the sphere of our conscious spirit, but he who would eat the almond must break its shell.

If we would pour light into dark regions, or those partially explored, and within the sphere of human capacity, and which are still regions of mists, and clouds, and darkness; if we would carry the blazing torch of demonstrated truth into every dark den, and invest, and encompass, and conquer the fortress where error lurks, and finds protection, we must by steady and unwearied marches observe successive phenomena, record facts, and trace them to their source, and garner them in the clear light of life, and make them the spring of trains of reasoning by which truth is acquired, and firmly and permanently established.

From a consideration of our powers, as perception, memory, and reason, we are forced to assume something as the constituted and ultimate principle of man. This cannot be one of these individual powers, but a unit and a central agent, while individual faculties are exerted with a reference to some specific office. To find the originating agent, we must thread a passage-way through these single faculties to the central orb or root and seed of action. The phenomena of the various attributes appear and disappear in the field of consciousness. They arise and vanish, but the nature in which they are grounded does not vanish, for it is the living soul.

What the essence of spirit is, created and uncreated, is a subject not open to the gaze of finite creatures. There is, however, a wide range of phenomenon indicating the fact of spirit or soul. Men who are endowed with the ordinary powers of reasoning, who feel and imagine, and will, know that these have their life and centre in the soul, and that this constitutes man's pre-eminence in the scale of being.

"The feeling of the unity of self, which attaches to the mental history of every man, must be referred for its cause to some internal property of the soul. Beyond the fact that you are compelled in every mental action to regard yourself as one being; one to whom information is brought in every perception, who commands in every act of will, who decides in every judgment; beyond this feeling of the unity of self, you cannot help searching for a cause of it; and this cause must be considered to lie where you are wont to place it, in the unknown nature of the soul.

We must in like manner have a cause in the soul of the natural feeling of our continued identity. Every perception affirms the existence of mind and object, and that at not a single point of time, but continued for a definite period." \*

3d. The soul's existence is seen as an intuition of the reason. By intuition we mean a looking upon, a beholding. It is usually restricted to the perceptions of the pure reason. Intuition is an act by which the mind perceives the reality of the existence of things and beings; and the innate agreement of ideas lying at their base, or their disagreement, or the truth of things when presented without the intervention of other ideas, or processes of reasoning used in other modes of attaining truth. Intuitive knowledge is that which is gained and is clear to the mind by bare inspection, or looking upon. This larger vision recognizes truth as it beholds it. To search for and find the ground and origin of innate assurance, is scarcely less than to find how the object of assurance exists, and why it exists.

Our timely and eternal considerations are such that we yield the audacious privilege of questioning why an intuition is truthful. Still we do not deny that we can exercise the power of denial, and of the most bitter and vicious doubts, as moral agents. We believe and we act, and we persist in duty because we rely on the truth of this principle.

\* Thompson's Theism.

There are the intellectual, the moral, and the esthetic intuitions. The first is the basis of our ideas of truth. The second is the foundation of our ideas of good. The third is the seed plot of our ideas of the beautiful, and the ideal world is formed from the three. We cannot well go back of the foundation of human reason, which gives us the light of its own grand and majestic intuitions. To illustrate, suppose that a child hears the report of fire-arms, and asks what is that? You explain to him, and he inquires again when he hears the crushing noise of a falling tree, leveled by the wood-man's sturdy blows? You tell him that the sound is produced by the vibrations of the air on the tympanum of the ear, the organ of sound; and further, that there are nerves of sensation conveying these vibrations to the brain; and that in the brain the soul has its seat, and hears all sounds and gathers treasures of truth. He may inquire why is there air with its surging waves; why are there nerves of most delicate texture; why is there an agent thus affected by sweet and harmonious sounds, or disturbed by harsh and discordant notes? But you have reached the limit of thought, and you stand confronted by a single and wonderful mystery, the Soul. You have attained the last and grandest human fact, for there is nothing anterior to this intuitive truth which you have recognized.

We admit these first truths seen in their own light, and then we float over their abyss, knowing that it centres in an unknown world, encompassed in profound mystery. We may shout question after question into this world of the supersensible soul, beyond the lines of its intuitional rays, but we receive no answer.

The limitations of our knowledge are as marked as our progress is grand. How little we know of our nature, our worth and destiny, how indifferent we are to it, and yet how full of import is the soul's life, as we must infer from the consideration of its spiritual import; from the analogies of nature; and from the teachings of revelation.

All the out-goings of the mind are from this point. They

radiate from this centre. Their foundation for truth is to recognize it in the light of intuition. The temples of truth, of knowledge, of the sciences, and of wisdom spring upwards and adorn man's life and add lustre to his nature from this broad pedestal. When Socrates unfolded and taught an age not favored with a revelation from heaven, those elevated views of a superintending providence, and the intimate relation between virtue and happiness, he started with the convictions of the truth of moral intuitions. And Plato when he taught that man participated in the divine intelligence, and that the forms of matter partook of the ideas, or patterns, or arche-types which were in the mind of the Infinite from eternity, rested on the intuitions of the reason.

Thus we see the being of our own souls in the light of their own intuitions. When our convictions are controverted, we still believe and know that we are not deceived. And our judgments arising therefrom may always be relied on, and are as safe in their conclusions as those based on mathematical demonstrations.

4TH. The existence of the Soul is seen in the light of consciousness. The consciousness is an ultimate principle. There is no higher evidence than that of a truthful man, when he says that he is conscious of a certain fact or reality. This is the basis of all reasoning in practical life. It is to questions of a mental and moral nature what the axiom or the solution of a problem is in mathematics, viz., proof so clear that no one can deny it. We depend on it with unwavering faith in our intellectual pursuits. We affirm one class of truths. We attain others by reasoning. To reason is to compare. In comparing we exercise memory. The memory is of no value further than the consciousness can be trusted. Thus it is in every instance where the intellect or the judgment is employed; we must and do rely on this principle, and we turn to it for proof of the reality of the spiritual nature. Can it be allowed, we inquire, to testify as to this truth, and that evidence be received at the tribunal of intellect? Why should we rule out the testi-

mony of this witness? We behold objects in nature. But the eye does not see its own seeing. The consciousness is a light and a sense of sight, by which it beholds its own beholding. The natural eye does not witness its own working, as does the former named. This is not only a witness to what is in the mind, but it is a witness to a witness which first is itself. There are those who regard this function of the mind in the light of an illumination. It illumines itself as the sun enables us to see its outline, however distant, by means of its own rays of light. These truths are valid in all the higher interests of life. There is nothing that ever illumines the soul, our conscious existence, which is seen by its own eye, and illuminates with its own light, and perceives the reality of its own existence like the consciousness. There can be no rational doubt of the existence of the soul, as it is a fact revealed by the first flash of consciousness. I know that I am a living soul, and not a dream. Very early in its history the child is self-informed of this truth, and learns to distinguish between that which is itself and that which is not. Of this reality the soul is self-informed before it has full command of its powers of discrimination, and before its appliances and machinery of words and distinctions have been brought into use.

"We are therefore compelled to ask, is this asserted analogy between our modes of consciousness in relation to matter and mind really tenable? Does it not rather appear a flat contradiction to maintain that I am not immediately conscious of myself, but only of my sensations and volitions? Who then is this I that is conscious; and how can I be conscious of such states as mine? In this case it would surely be far more accurate to say, not that I am conscious of my sensations, but that the sensation is conscious of itself; but thus worded, the glaring absurdity of the theory would carry into it, its own refutation. The one presented substance, the source from which our data for thinking on the subject are originally drawn, is myself. Whatever may be the variety of the phenomena of consciousness, sensation by this or that organ, volitions,

thoughts, imaginations, of all we are immediately conscious as affections of one and the same self. It is not by any after-effort of reflection that I combine together sight and hearing, thought and volition, into factitious unity or compounded whole: in each case I am immediately conscious of myself hearing, willing and thinking.

This self-personality, like all other single and immediate presentations, is indefinable; but it is so because it is superior to definition. It can be analyzed into no simpler elements, for it is itself the simplest of all; it can be made no clearer by description or comparison, for it is revealed to us in all the clearness of an original intuition, of which description and comparison can furnish only faint and partial resemblances.

The extravagant speculation into which metaphysicians attempted to explain the nature and properties of the soul, as it is not given in consciousness, furnishes no valid ground for renouncing all inquiry into its character, as a power, conscious of itself. That there are many metaphysical or rather psychological difficulties, still unsolved, connected with this view of the subject, must be allowed; but, so long as we remain within the legitimate field of consciousness, we are not justified in abandoning them as insoluble. To this class belong the question of Personal identity, or the reference of earlier and later states of consciousness to the same subject; an immediate consciousness being of present objects only."\*

The recognition of ourselves is the primitive recognition. The believer and the unbeliever; the sceptic and the faith-disciple, are alike bound to admit that there are certain primary truths, and that on these all reasoning is founded. These are the starting points for all investigations and all reasoning. Without them the whole process is void and baseless as a vision. Among the leading primary truths are those of the consciousness. This we cannot doubt, for doubt is an affection, or an accident of the

\* Mansell's *Prolegomena Logica*.

mind, and can be known only as far as it is the subject of consciousness.

"In the act of sensible perception," says Sir Wm. Hamilton, "I am conscious of two things;—of myself as the perceiving subject, and of an external reality, in relation with my sense, as the object perceived. Of the existence of both of these things I am convinced, because I am conscious of knowing each of them, not mediately in something else as represented, but immediately, in itself, as existing. Of their mutual independence I am not less convinced, because each is apprehended equally and at once, in the same indivisible energy, the one not preceding or determining, the other not followed or determined; and because each is apprehended out of, and in direct contrast to the other."

The convictions of common sense and the testimony of consciousness, must be accepted as universal truth, or they must be rejected on the same grand scale. If we begin with this truth as the basis of reasoning, and admit it, we are competent to prove every thing that comes within its scope. Just as when we admit or receive an axiom in mathematical science, we can prove one point after another through the whole department and circle of truth. These psychological facts are simple intuitional truths. They are primitive conceptions and depend on nothing but being seen as self-evident. They cannot be proved by reasoning, for they are above the level of reason, and are self-demonstrative. To illustrate: We behold the sun in the noon-day heavens. Its rays of heat, light, and chemism are poured on the earth and nature smiles. Its light illumines all the earth. And by its light we are able to see the sun itself; and the phenomenon which is the result of its own existence. We do not require another light to make it manifest. We could not prove its existence more conclusively by a light less clear, than that which now gives us a knowledge of it by sight. Does it not see itself in its own light? And what clearer, faint light can be given to establishing in the mind the conviction that the soul has a valid being, and that this is a truth above doubt?

We carry the appeal to the soul itself. Does not the soul know its own existence? We question the consciousness of one and all. We appeal to the experience. Does it not recognize its own personal, spiritual existence? No account can be given of the thinking principle, if the validity of the consciousness is denied. (a.) In our search for truth, there is a field for faith based on the universal convictions of the race, and our native beliefs, which are essential parts of our moral and rational life. (b.) There are ample and broad domains for induction, and our conclusions from inductions, while they may from time to time be modified, are the result of human research and experience, and are valid. (c.) There is a broad domain for the intuitionist to lay deep and permanent his foundations and these abide beyond a rational doubt. (d) The consciousness enters the arena with its clear and creamy rays of light, which wavers not, and this light will never be outshone or eclipsed only by rays from the spirit world, and the primal fountain of all life and light and love. Each is valid in its own sphere. And when all join in their testimony, we may not doubt the truth of our conclusions. In our reasonings on all subjects, and in forming opinions, we should receive all that is good, and cast away or hold for further light, whatever cannot stand a close investigation. Whenever we subject any question to a test, we must proceed on certain principles. If we resort to an induction of facts, we must receive none that are doubtful. If reasoning is involved, the approved rules of logic must be observed, and then we can determine the validity of the conclusion. In as far as it claims to be intuitional, metaphysical science is entitled to demand that the principles involved be shown to be in the constitution of the subject. If consciousness is the test, the testimony must be self-evident, necessary and universal. If faith is the ground, it must be determinate in specifications, and somewhat formalized, that we may comprehend its basis, and see whether it covers the case under consideration. There is the conviction that we are souls, based on these four foundations. The structure reared on each one, joins all the others, and forms the basis for all truth.

Thus we have given a statement of the grounds of the conviction that we are souls. While the question is rarely raised, it may be serviceable to some persons, of a speculative tendency, to find in a narrow compass, a statement of the basis of the reality. It may serve to remove some doubts, for doubts there are, that are most torturing to the soul of many inquirers, and dissipate the cloud that hangs with heavy folds over anxious, truth-seeking mortals. If this is the result, we shall be amply repaid for the time, the study, and the thought bestowed on the subject.

---

#### ART. IV.—AN EXEGETICAL STUDY OF JUDE VERSE 9.

---

"Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, the Lord rebuke thee."

THE key to the correct interpretation of this Epistle, is found, we think, in understanding its true relation to 2 Peter ii.\*

\* The genuineness of 2 Peter is taken for granted in the following article. We have not time nor inclination to follow the critics, ancient or modern, through the labyrinth of speculation and conjecture upon this vexed question. Suffice it to say at present, that the external testimony decidedly favors the genuineness, while internal evidence so strongly proves the Petrine origin to our mind that we are lost in wonder at the ingenuity with which such a man as Neander uses the rack and screw of the Destructive Criticism to establish his position that the letter is a "forgery of the Anti-Gnostics." In a note to p. 347 of the "Planting and Training of the Christian Church," (Am. ed.) he states succinctly eleven "principal marks of spuriousness." Some of these are gratuitous assumptions, as when he speaks of the "use here made of the epistle of Jude, which is *partly copied* (the italics are ours) and *partly imitated*;" some, untrue statements, as when he speaks of the "doubts respecting the second coming of Christ;" and some, unfair perversions, as when he objects to the application of the word *ypa&gt;i* to Paul's epistles, contrary to usus which in the apostolic epistles confines the term to Old Testament writings; as if there were

The most cursory comparison of these two passages establishes the fact of their close relationship. The same figures occur in both, the same historical examples; nay, what is still more remarkable, a frequent identity in words and clauses. The *nature* of this relationship, however, has long been disputed. Was Jude's epistle the original whence Peter drew or *vice versa*? Or did the one, though acquainted with the writing of the other, forbear to use it? The latter theory seems untenable, when the above-noted resemblance is considered, a resemblance which for closeness and length is without parallel in the New Testament writers. Of the two former views, that which assigns the priority in time to Peter's epistle seems satisfactorily established not only by the *a priori* argument, that it is unlikely that the prince of the Apostles would draw from one evidently less gifted than himself, and that too without any acknowledgment like that made in the case of Paul (2 Pet. iii. 15), but chiefly by the internal evidence of the epistles themselves. Thus, among other things, Peter says, (ii. 2,) "there shall be false teachers among you," speaking in the future tense: (Jude ver. 4) speaks of their appearance as an accomplished fact, "There are certain men crept in," etc. (Compare also Jude ver. 18 with 2 Pet. iii. 3.)

If then Peter's epistle be prior, there can be little doubt as to the nature of the relation between the two passages. It is evidently that of recorded prophecy and recorded fulfillment. Peter predicts; Jude describes. The former catches distant glimpses of the sunken rocks that threaten shipwreck to the infant Church; the latter sees the Church among the breakers. Here is a counterpart under the New Testament dispensation

any other passage in which New Testament writings are expressly referred to, and which would therefore admit an expansion of the application of the word.

The whole note merits careful study as a curious specimen of the reckless cutting and slashing of the subjective criticism, so-called. Upon such petty quibbling we are asked to reject from the canon precious portions of both Testaments.

See on this whole question Pref. to Frönmüller's Com. on 2 Pet. in Lange's Bibelwerk—also Alford's Proleg. to N. T. vol. 4, pt. I.

of that interesting phenomenon so common under the Old, when inspired prophets 'continued to search out and track out' (the figure is that of tracking an animal by its foot-prints) the meaning of their own prophecies (1 Pet. i. 10.) Here the picture is one of inspired Apostles diligently studying one another's writings that they may become better qualified for the duties of the apostolic office. Peter, in all humility, admires the "wisdom given" to "our beloved brother Paul," and doubtless pondered long and anxiously over those δύσηδητά τῶν, "things hard to be understood," in his epistles. Jude carefully studies the prophecy of Peter and verifies it point by point in the contemporary history of the life and doctrines of the heretics, while with beautiful humility, keeping himself in the background, he calls upon the brethren (v. 17) to "remember the words which were spoken before of the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ," Paul and Peter. Thus did one Apostle pass on to another the torch of truth kindled and fed by the Holy Ghost. Thus did the logical acuteness and doctrinal teachings of Paul become inwrought into the mental fibre of Peter, and the practical sagacity and native shrewdness of observation of Peter throw their light upon the more purely receptive intellect of Jude.

The relation we have indicated is not merely an example of curious parallelism. As has been said, it forms the important element in the correct interpretation of Jude's epistle. It explains most satisfactorily the resemblance and the differences, what is common to both and what is peculiar to each. The character of Jude's epistle as the record of a fulfilled prophecy best accounts for the minuteness of the agreement. Here at the very threshold of the Christian Church, the Holy Spirit erects

Monumentum aere perennius

of the divine origin of that Church. Clear proof was given of the divine original of Judaism by the signs and wonders in Egypt and the wilderness. So here, what more convincing

testimony could be had than a minute prophecy of the enemies of the Church of Christ, giving the smallest details of their characters and lives, by one inspired Founder, and a still more minute history, drawn from the life, of these same men, by another—the two, history and prophecy, corresponding in every particular! Peter sitting at one canvas and with pencil guided by the Divine Artist, drawing the features of those Arch-heretics who were to arise—Jude at another, reproducing from actual knowledge and personal acquaintance, lineament by lineament, the portrait of the other! If fulfilled prophecy be one of the strongest external evidences of the truth of Christianity, surely this example deserves to head the list, for here can be no doubt either of the reality or accuracy of the fulfillment. The evidence furnished by ecclesiastical history establishes the truth and fulness of Jude's description beyond the cavils of the skeptic. The circumstantiality with which Jude delineates, transmutes the external evidence to his own truthfulness, into infallible internal testimony to the inspiration of Peter.

The greater fulness of Jude flows naturally from his relative position. He reads from the history of his own times, and therefore gives particular traits which are wanting in the prophecy. The outlines are all there, here is the filling up. For instance, the "false teachers" Peter mentions (2 Pet. ii. 1) are here identified by special features in their private and public life (ver. 4.) The historical examples by which the nature of their sins is illustrated are here more numerous, and adjusted to each phase (vv. 5-7, 11.) The series of metaphors (vv. 12, 18) by which their sins are further described, taken from natural objects,—rocks, clouds, trees, waves, stars,—is remarkable for its gradual climax and the elaborate finish of each member. To be noted also, in this connection, is the tone of indignation in which Jude writes. It is the deep feeling of a holy man brought into close contact with hypocritical professors, who, like wolves in sheep's clothing, were propagating "damnable heresies" among the flock of Christ, ungodly

men who had "crept into the Church unawares," "stealing the livery of heaven, to serve the devil in." The style of Peter's prophecy is more calm and deliberate. Jude is rapid, impetuous, heaping historical examples upon literal description, figures upon examples, anathema upon figures, and closing the descriptive portion of the epistle with the sublime Apocalyptic vision of Enoch, Jehovah Christ sitting in judgment upon the enemies of His Church (vv. 14, 15.) The transitions are abrupt, characterized by an absence of connectives, (asyndeta) as in the heat of indignant feeling the thoughts pass swiftly through his mind like the shifting scenes of a diorama. No less than eighteen  $\delta\tauα\zeta\lambdaεγόμενα$  occur in the short compass of five-and-twenty verses, the novelty of the heresies apparently leading the writer to the use of words hitherto unknown to the vocabulary of the New Testament. These marks of impassioned earnestness and fervor, among others, render the style not unlike passages in the Philippians of Demosthenes.

A brief analysis of the context will prepare the way for a proper understanding of our verse. In vv. 3, 4, the Apostle states the occasion of his letter. He seems to have been making diligent preparation, perhaps gathering materials, to write to the churches of Asia Minor, to whom Peter had written, (1 Pet. i. 1) on the subject of their "common salvation," *i. e.*, the gospel by which they were saved, (Heb. ii. 9). While so engaged, the execution of his purpose was hastened by the sudden outbreak of the Gnostic heresies, and he instantly writes to warn the Christians of this new danger from within, as Peter in his first epistle had warned them of external persecutions. This change of plan, which not only hastened the publication of the letter, but also probably modified its form from doctrinal and didactic to descriptive and hortatory, is indicated by the transition from the presents  $\piοιούμενος γράφειν$  to the aorists  $\xiσχον γράψαι$ —'while continuing to make every diligent effort to write,' 'I suddenly had need to write at once.'

It was, undoubtedly, some peculiar and alarming crisis in the history of the churches that occasioned this change of plan

on the part of the writer. Thiersch characterizes it as "that great catastrophe, the mighty breaking forth of an unparalleled wicked Gentile gnosis which was posterior to the ministry of Paul and anterior to that of John." Scattered here and there through the Pauline epistles, we find dim intimations of the rise of these hydra-headed heresies. Already to the church of Colosse, Paul had raised the warning cry, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ," (Col. ii. 8) and branding with falsehood those doctrines, soon to emerge, which impugned on one side the humanity, on the other the divinity of our Lord, he formulates with dialectic precision for all future time the glorious truth of the constitution of the Person of the God-man, "for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Again, he warns Timothy to give no heed to 'myths and endless genealogies,' meaning, as Neander thinks, "legendary tales respecting the origin and propagation of false spirits," and, further on, against 'profane and vain babblings and antitheses,' (contrary doctrines) 'of the falsely named gnosis,' (1 Tim. i. 4, vi. 20). And to Titus he writes to the same effect, (Tit. iii. 9-11). As we pass to the Petrine epistles, the warning cry deepens in intensity and volume. His first letter is concerned with external enemies and coming persecutions; the second, from the beginning of the second chapter to the close of the epistle, is one prolonged prophecy of internal dangers. As we read we seem to feel the ground tremble beneath our feet with the throes of the advancing earthquake; we hear the mutterings of the tempest about to burst upon the churches.

If we pause to ask, how it happened that in the brief interval from Peter's prophecy (probably not more than five years) these heresies could have become so wide-spread and formidable as to call for the instant interference of the Apostle, we come upon one of the most interesting problems of history. How is it that at certain periods, startling events succeed each other

so rapidly that the work of a century seems compressed into a decade or even less?

How is it that in the ceaseless ebb and flow of human affairs, there are sudden tidal waves that whelm a continent, just as in nature in apparent disregard of the customary law of slow accretions and triturations, the work of ages, there occur now and then sudden upheavals and disappearances of vast tracts. Such phenomena are not infrequent. The French revolution of 1789 lasted comparatively but a brief period. Yet it changed the face of Europe. It swept away old abuses, it blotted out old ideas and turned the current of the world's thought into new channels. Danton, Robespierre, Marat, the Girondists, the Jacobins, overthrew a State and drowned it in blood, but they saved a continent to liberty and law. So the decade in our own national history, which began with the outbreak of the civil war. More problems, social, political, moral and religious were solved in those ten years than in all the previous life of the nation. So, too, in contemporary European history, the five years from the battle of Sadowa in 1866, to the sack of Paris by the Communists in 1871.

Are not such periods as these the harvest times of Providence when the crop is being gathered for which ages of time and generations of the race have been sowing the seed and tilling the soil? Are they not beacon fires, which, like those that signalled the downfall of old Troy, tell of the overthrow of the works of human pride and power, and the final triumph of the great King? They seem so to the humble faith which regards them as the voice of God to the nations, as conscience is His voice to the individual soul. A faith which does not discard reason nor discourage her efforts to explain the second causes of these phenomena, but on the contrary, exalts her into a handmaid of revelation, and interprets her conclusions by the light of the gospel.

Such a period was that in which Jude wrote. Hostile elements met face to face in the church. Jewish traditions and heathen philosophy, the sublime truths of Christianity and the

puerile and sensual fictions of Pagan religions, an humble faith and a proud reason. The result could be nothing but conflict, for these elements can not assimilate. From the struggle Christianity came forth triumphant, stronger because more conscious of her strength. On the other side emerged a legion of heresies, representing every shade of erroneous belief and practice, from the gross sensuality of the Nicolaitanes to the refined scepticism of the Docetæ. (See Neander's *P. and T. of Christian Ch.*, pp. 360-3).

These heresies the Apostle goes on to describe (ver. 4) by two characteristic traits, 1. Antinomianism, impiously perverting the grace of God into licentiousness; saying practically let us "continue in sin that grace may abound," (Rom. vi. 1; iii. 5). 2. Apostasy, 'by denying Jesus Christ to be our only Master and Jehovah,' *i. e.*, rejecting the Messiahship of Christ. Then follow, (vv. 5-7,) three historical examples, showing the certainty of their punishment by that inflicted for like sins on Israel in the wilderness; on the fallen angels for apostasy, and on the cities of the plain for licentiousness. Note here the climax; neither individuals, nor communities of men, nor yet angels, beings of a higher order, escape the penalty of transgression. Ver. 8 resumes the description of their sins, threefold, (*a*) Licentiousness, 'are defiling the body,' like the Sodomites last mentioned; (*b*) Rebellion, 'are trying to put away rulers,' spiritual and evil, the sin of the fallen angels; (*c*) Slander of dignities, 'are speaking evil of glories,' *i. e.*, they who have and deserve glory, good angels; as did Israel in the wilderness, who continually murmured against the Angel of the Covenant.

In illustration of the sin last mentioned, 'speaking evil of angels,' (E. V. "dignities,") may be mentioned the Simonians, a sect which Simon Magus (Acts viii. 9, etc.) is supposed to have founded. These men represented the angels as the offspring of Simon and his mistress Helena. And according to Irenæus, Menander, Simon's successor, called himself the Saviour, and affirmed that he could impart knowledge greater

than that of the angels (See further Neander's Ch. History, v. 1, p. 453, 4. Am. Ed.)

In ver. 9, the Apostle goes on to show the heinous nature of this sin by an argument *a fortiori*. 'But,' (introducing a contrast that shows the aggravation of their sin) 'Michael, the archangel,' (one of the seven spirits who stand in the immediate presence of God and rule the other angels, Rev. viii. 2 : xii. 7 ; believed by the Jews to be the patron of their nation, Dan. x. 13, 21, xii. 1. Note here the emphasis given by the position of our word and by the repetition of the article), 'when in contending' (by words) 'for' the possession of 'the body of Moses, did not dare,' (from profound dread of the majesty of God, Satan's judge, Rom. xii. 19) 'to bring against him' a judicial sentence for slander, (Gen. of crime, not qualifying Gen. as E. V., "railing accusation ;" for 1. It would be impossible to slander Satan. 2. This interpretation destroys one of the main features of the implied antithesis, viz. : the *truth* of the sentence which Michael might have pronounced contrasted with the *falsehood* of the accusations brought by these men against the angels), but on the contrary, said, 'Jehovah rebuke' (and restrain) 'thee.' (Cf. Zech. iii. 2.)

The chief points of contrast, then, showing the greatness of the sin denounced in ver. 8, are four ; (a) Archangel contrasted with men ; (b) Satan, with good angels ; (c) Slander, with just judicial sentence ; (d) Occasion, execution of God's command to bury the body of Moses, with evil passions of the heretics and false doctrines.

The substance of the argument may be thus expressed : If the highest angel hindered in the discharge of duty thought it presumptuous to pass just sentence upon the Prince of demons, how aggravated the presumptuous wickedness of these men in slandering good angels under no provocation but that of their own evil passions.

What is meant by the "body of Moses" in this connection for which Michael is represented as contending ? The usus of the word *σῶμα*, we think, fixes the meaning here.

It is used in the New Testament over 140 times in some one of five main senses; (See Rob. Lex. of N. T. s. v.) 1. An organized material substance, 1 Cor. xv. 37; 2. Animal body (*a*) Of man, *living* or *dead*; (*b*) Of beasts, *living* or *dead*; 3. By synecdoche of part for whole, Persons; 4. By metonymy of physical for ideal, Church as organized; 5. By metonymy of substance for attribute, reality as opposed to shadow, Col. ii. 17. Of these senses, 2. (*a*) seems alone applicable here, and most agree in explaining our word of the *dead body* of Moses committed by God to the angel for burial. The fanciful conjecture mentioned by Scott and by Whitby, that it denotes the "Jewish Church" is disproved not only by the scope of the passage which is evidently the record of a fact and not an allegory, but also by the usage. That sense is not legitimate. As above noted under 4, the word is used of the Church as an organic body, but *always* in the sixteen passages in which it has this sense, of the *Christian* Church. (Vid. Col. i. 18, 24, which are the *loci classici*.)

The record here adds a further circumstance to the account of the death and burial of Moses given by Joshua in Deut. xxxiv. There we last catch sight of the great Lawgiver, as with slow and solemn step he ascends Mount Pisgah to its summit Nebo, as forty years before he had climbed the steeps of Sinai, going now to survey with an "eye which was not dimmed" by 120 years the fair land promised to Abraham five centuries before. Passing from the gaze of his weeping people, the children of those with whom he had set out forty years before, and whose bones were whitening in the wilderness, to his solitary communion with Jehovah, to die and to be buried by his hand "in a ravine before Beth-Peor." Grand old Prophet! Fitting type of Him, who, long ages after, from the opposite heights of Olivet, across the Jordan, was to ascend before the eyes of His sorrowful disciples to His Father and their Father! Great in life—greater in death—greatest of all as pointing in life and death to that divine Prophet whom God was to raise up! Moses died and was buried, but "no man knoweth of his sepul-

chre unto this day." Christ died and was buried in the tomb of Joseph, but "saw no corruption." "Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it." (Acts ii. 24.)

The additional fact, mentioned here only in the sacred writings, is probably drawn from oral tradition. Ecumenius mentions the belief entertained by the Jews in these words: "That God had charged Michael with the burial of Moses; that Satan opposed him, bringing an accusation against him, relating to the murder of the Egyptian, in consequence of which he was unworthy of such honorable burial." From whatever source derived, the circumstance here given by the Apostle must be accepted as the record of a fact, and not with Dr. Bloomfield in his note on vv. 14, 15: contradicting his previous comment on our verse, as a "popular illustration of the weighty maxim not to speak evil of dignities, given by the Apostle from tradition, without vouching for its truth." If our exegesis be correct, the passage forms the premise of a logical argument, remarkable for symmetry and strength, and in interpretation a broad line must be drawn between rhetorical allusions to illustrate or enforce some truth, and the members of a syllogism that bind one conclusion to another. The former may or may not be vouched by the writer; other considerations must determine; the latter must.

We have said, the last glimpse of the Prophet, clothed in mortal flesh, is on the slopes of Pisgah, as he ascends to that solitary communion with Jehovah. Fifteen centuries later he reappears for a little season, an actor in that most wondrous scene of the Transfiguration. With Elijah he stands talking with Jesus on the summit, be it of Tabor or of Hermon, before the eyes of the three wondering disciples. Representative of an economy that had waxed old and was ready to vanish away, he bows in adoring homage to Him from whose majestic form flashed the visible brightness of the Godhead, and over whom hung the mysterious Shekinah. No longer does he behold the "back parts" of the divine majesty from a cleft of the rock,

but his prayer is granted, and he sees the King in his glory face to face. Wondrous spectacle! So vividly impressed upon the memory of Peter that the recollections of the "holy mount" and its glories cheered the closing scenes of his eventful life and cast their brightness on the dark shadows that filled his prophetic mind as he surveyed the future of the Church. It were vain to ask, With what body did Moses come? Doubtless with that *σῶμα ἐπουράνιον* of which the Apostle speaks to the Corinthians. The "psychical" body had long returned to dust, the "pneumatic" body was not yet; his actual body must have been one suited to the heavenly life and yet visible to the mortal sight of the disciples. Let us seek to penetrate no farther these mysteries of another state of being. Better far, let us with the trembling three, "fear, as they enter into the cloud."

This noble Epistle merits the careful study of every Christian, be he layman or cleric. Not alone on account of the eventful period in Church History it portrays, a period of transition from that state of internal peace and quiet described by Luke in the Acts, when the Christians "continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers," (Acts ii. 42), to those times of spiritual declension, when the Gnostic heresies here so minutely set forth were being gradually consolidated and organized under somewhat different forms into that "mystery of iniquity," that "Man of Sin," 'that Lawless whom Jehovah Jesus shall destroy by the breath of his mouth,' (2 Thes. ii. 8). Not only, we say, should Jude be studied for his value in historical connections, but also, and mainly, because in many respects the times in which we live are a reflection of his own. History repeats itself. The pebble dropped into the water, by an unvarying law of dynamics, gives rise to circles, never to any other geometric figure. By the uniform law of chemical attraction, the same base combining in equal quantities with the same acid always forms the same salt. So in the moral world. The same moral forces acting under like conditions always

yield the same results. The same struggle is going on between reason and faith, a proud human reason, which now, as then, is found, when analyzed, to contain just two elements, intense hatred of God in Christ, the God-man, and a minute portion of science, "falsely so called," because its subject matter is wrenched from its connections with the whole of things. The struggle is producing the same results; on one side a Christianity stronger, because more conscious of her strength; on the other, a swarm of heresies in Church and State, from the refined skepticism of which Darwin and Herbert Spencer may be taken as types, to the gross sensualism of those who would abrogate the marriage tie and riot in all the excesses of socialistic anarchy. Now as then it behooves to heed carefully the admonition of the Apostle (ver. 3), 'continue to agonize earnestly,' (like an athlete in the games) 'for the doctrine once for all' (no second gospel to be expected) 'delivered to the saints.' This divine πατέρις is the touchstone, the spear of Ithuriel in the hand of the Church. "If they speak not according to THIS WORD it is because there is no light in them." (Is. viii. 20).

"For no falsehood can endure  
Touch of celestial temper, but returns  
Of force to its own likeness."

T. ROMEYN BECK.

## ART. V.—INFANT BAPTISM.\*

BY REV. D. LANTZ.

*"For the promise is unto you and to your children."—Acts ii. 39.*

THE Greek word here translated *promise*, should be translated *command*,—"The command is unto you and to your children."

The sacrament of baptism was instituted by our Lord before His departure from His disciples; but its true light and life-giving force was not fully brought to view till on the day of Pentecost. And as it is the outward sign of regeneration, and the passing over from an old into a new life, and a putting on of Christ, it first appears in its true Christian character as the church-founding sacrament in the regeneration of Judaism to Christianity.

The first instance of Christian baptism by the Apostles was the planting of the Church into Jesus Christ by baptizing it in its infancy.

Baptism by water is a fit emblem, symbolizing the regenerating and purifying powers of the Holy Spirit. Hence it is used as the indispensable means going before the renewing of the Holy Ghost, and thus embalming it as a necessary factor in its birth. If, then, it was an important and necessary part in the creation of the Church, and that in its infancy, it is evident that the same fact still inheres in its more advanced history among its individual members. Baptism is now what it was then, "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." By it we are received into the fellowship, both of the death and life of Christ, adopted as the children of God and

\* Read before the Ministerial Association of the Northern Illinois Classis.

made heirs of eternal life. But, although to be baptized is to be born again, it does not follow that we are at once full-grown men and women in Christ. The child which is born into the natural world requires time, and food, and the fostering care of its natural mother, before it reaches the maturity of manhood. So the child that is born again by "water and the Spirit," only in a much higher sense, needs the nurturing care of its spiritual mother before it becomes a full-grown man in Christ Jesus. It is for this reason evidently, that Christ instituted *infant baptism*, so that from their infancy they may begin to grow in grace as well as in nature. And then, to be born in old age is contrary to the very idea of birth. It was very natural for Nicodemus to ask, "How can a man be born when he is old?"

Much that is said and done against infant baptism, arises altogether from a want of correct information as to the true nature of either infant or adult baptism. It is a sacrament which exists by virtue of the Holy Spirit, by whom it is superintended and receives all its significance, and who guides into all truth. Hence it is, that since the days of the Apostles, the Church has maintained infant baptism with firmness and with great success against all opposition. We say since the days of the Apostles, because we are fully satisfied that the Apostles themselves baptized infants, that it was received as a matter of course, and that it was at once regarded as the antitype of circumcision. Although the utmost nerve has been strained, on the part of the opposition to show that this could not have been the case, they have not succeeded in furnishing any proof to the contrary.

We shall, therefore, at least attempt to show, both by circumstantial and historical evidences that *infant baptism* was the rule of the Church ever since the days of the Apostles, and adult baptism the necessary exception.

Much is said by anti-pedobaptists against infant baptism, because there is no positive command to that effect, and therefore it is not taught, we are told, either by Christ or His Apostles. But may we not with equal propriety, and just as much

authority ask where is the command that sets apart adults only for baptism? And at what particular time were children, who were alike with the parents in the covenant, taken out? Does not the command of Christ to the Apostles "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations by baptizing them," include children just as much as adults? Where is the authority for us to discriminate when we know that up to this time there was no difference made between parent and child?

Adult baptism was, and still is, the necessary exception. Just as under the Abrahamic covenant, infant circumcision was the rule, and a direct command, and adult circumcision the exception, so in regard to baptism. The Church in its apostolic period was a missionary church, and the labor of the Apostles was purely missionary labor. This from its very nature made it necessary to baptize adults. The same necessity still exists among our missionaries in foreign lands.

Again, the idea of a birth also comprehends the necessity of a mother. But Eve, the mother of us all, could not be born according to the natural order, hence she is a necessary exception to the rule, and we have in her as well as in the law of generation a supernatural creation. So also the idea of a spiritual birth comprehends the necessity of a spiritual mother, hence we have the miracle of Pentecost, a supernatural birth of a spiritual mother, with the laws of regeneration. Just as the idea of a natural birth necessarily implies the idea of a mother, so baptism has no significance only as it stands connected with regeneration, or a new birth.

When, therefore, the feast of Pentecost came, and with it these supernatural manifestations, the exhibition was overwhelming; the people became alarmed, and asked, "What meaneth this?" The strange language which these men now spoke sounded to them like the confused unmeaning language of intoxicated persons; and they said, "These men are full of new wine." But Peter told them they were not drunken; but this what they here saw and heard was only the completion of the great plan of human redemption. "God raised up Christ, whom

they had crucified, and exalted Him in glory, who now poured out His Spirit." This brought conviction to their heart, for they knew that they had "crucified the Lord of glory," and they asked, "Men and brethren what shall we do?"

All this now was divinely arranged; the above question was dictated by the Holy Ghost so as to open the way to lay down the doctrine of Christianity as the foundation upon which the Church should be built. The subject was of too much importance to be answered by mere human authority. While the language is the language of the Apostle Peter, who is simply used as the *persona* of communication, the answer itself, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," etc., is the answer of the Holy Ghost. This is the *petra* upon which Christ said He would build His Church.

Now, then, who that is not blind through prejudice, will say that children are not included in this answer? And among this vast multitude were children of all ages, from the infant on its mother's arm, up to mature age. Who then should be the judges to determine at what particular age the children would be too young still to be included in the command? There was danger here of making very serious mistakes; some might have been misjudged and thus be baptized too young, and if the validity of baptism hinged upon their faith, as we are told, which they could as yet not properly appreciate; then their baptism would not be valid, and they, by a mistake, would necessarily be excluded from the kingdom of heaven.

And again, why should children not be baptized for the remission of sins, and receive the gift of the Holy Ghost? Are they not alike sinful with their parents? It is said that we are conceived and born in sin. When Christ said, "ye must be born again," He comprehended the human family, the child no less than the parent. Christ has opened a way for sin and uncleanness, and says "He is that way, and no one cometh to the Father but by Him." But if we deny children the rite of baptism

we do not, as parents, allow them to come to Christ, and hence they cannot come to the Father.

Another reason for saying that children are comprehended in the Apostle's command is because the command is direct, "to you and your children." Now when Peter said "repent and be baptized," he evidently did not intend to say that the command to *repent* was to the children; such a thing would be impossible. Because repentance implies a knowledge of sin, of God, of law, and a consciousness of having transgressed a law; of all this the child is ignorant. If any part of the command, therefore, can be to the children it must be the part to be baptized. We would ask those who forbid little children to come to Christ what language they would use to make it clearer that Peter included children than that which is used? It is very evident that the Apostle was careful to guard this subject so as to prevent children from being debarred from the kingdom of heaven. As the whole transaction on the day of Pentecost was dictated by the Holy Ghost, who well knew that these peculiar objections would come, He made provision to meet them when they did come.

It was also of very great importance that the subject should be made clear, not only for the future church, but even for those who were present at that church-founding sacrament. Because those assembled there were from all parts of Judaism, who came for the purpose of attending a religious festival which was divinely enjoined upon them. They were, therefore, the pious men and women of Israel, and the most devout and strictest observers of the law, all of whom, under the same circumstances, would have said, as the young man did to Christ, "All these things have I kept from my youth up." And there were also present at this time mothers, with their infant babes, many of whom were doubtless already dedicated to God by circumcision according to the law. Now if this new doctrine, which to them seemed to set aside all the rights and ceremonies of Judaism would in any way have had even the appearance of excluding children from the same privileges

with the parent it would at once have been rejected by every parent.

And those Scribes and Pharisees were here also who were ever ready to raise objections to the teachings of Christ and the Apostles, in everything that in their opinion was not strictly in harmony with the law of Moses. And yet there is not a word of objection made because children are excluded from the rite of baptism. Now, then, these holy mothers in Israel, as well as the Scribes and Pharisees, must, in some way or another, have been fully convinced, through the teachings of the Apostles, that their children were included in the command to be baptized; because with the teaching which they had in the Abrahamic covenant, from their youth up, they would not embrace any law or doctrine that would exclude their children.

Again, much is said about the necessity of faith as a qualification for baptism, because it is said "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." This often repeated argument has become stale on the lips of the anti-pedobaptist. No more miserable subterfuge can easily be conceived than to bring this forward as an argument against infant baptism. Faith and baptism are here taken as cause and effect, but viewed even in that sense its claimants, in order to give it the appearance of a favorable argument, are driven to the necessity of making the effect the cause, and the cause the effect. It is assumed here that there can be no baptism without faith, whereas the truth is that there can be no saving faith without baptism. If there is any thing in this text about infant baptism, it is immeasurably more for than against it. With such hermeneutics of the Bible we cannot help feeling, even if we should be slow to express it, "Thou art weighed in the balance and art found wanting."

There is a faith, however, which may be said to go before baptism, and which a mere historical knowledge of the plan of salvation may produce; but this at best can be nothing more than also a historical faith. And yet this faith, even historical as it is, may be regarded as of some account, because it may

serve as a soil into which baptism as a seed can be planted. For baptism, it must be remembered, is a divine ordinance, and must not be administered promiscuously in the world, but to such only who, through the means of grace, have become convinced of the necessity of baptism to prepare them for heaven. This faith needs, however, not necessarily be in the child, but it may be either in the parent or the sponsor, who are the sureties of the child. It is in such a historical faith only where the baptismal seed can germinate and grow and produce the ripe fruit of saving faith.

However true it may be that the child is incapable of exercising faith, it is also equally true that the children of believing parents may become subjects of grace by virtue of the faith of the parent. Thus in the case of the Syrophenician woman, "O woman great is thy faith—and her daughter was made whole from that very hour." And the son of the nobleman of Capernaum was restored, because it is said of his father, that he "believed the word that Jesus had spoken to him." And then Lazarus was raised from the dead, not on account of his own faith, because he was dead and buried; but on account of the faith of his sisters.

Again, we are told that "God is the author, as well as the finisher of our faith," and as the end of every historic process is always potentially contained in the beginning, the historic faith, which is the effect of the preached gospel, must already contain the life-giving power in such a way as to cause the seed to germinate when planted by baptism. Nor will this power cause the seed merely to germinate, but it will continue until that which was originally contemplated in the beginning of this organic life process has come to its full actualization in saving faith as the ripe fruit. It must, however, be remembered here that the mysterious advancing of this life-process is the work of a superhuman power. Humanity in its abnormal state is entirely too insufficient to work itself up into this higher spiritual life. It is here where God works in us both to will and to do. Hence, it is God who through His own appointed means

works in us from first to last, and thus completes the work which He has begun.

Such, then, being the case, that God, and not man, is the beginner and the finisher, and consequently the entire moving power through the entire process, there surely can be no reason why its beginning should be put off until we are grown up to be old sinners; why it would not be far better to begin in the more passive state of helpless infancy. If the wisdom or intellectual culture of man would need be brought into requisition, then adult years certainly would be preferable.

Nature is the shadow of grace, or the kingdom of nature is the shadow of the kingdom of grace, and from the shadow it is possible to form some idea of at least the outlines of the reality which produces the shadow. Hence we have in the book of nature that which is designed to direct our understanding in this somewhat mystical subject. Just as the growth of the body stands related to the birth of the child; so the growth in grace stands related to baptism and regeneration. This is evidently the idea which our Lord intended to convey when He said, " Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." By our natural birth we are born into this world by causes which are wholly extraneous, over which we have no control, and of which we are consequently entirely unconscious. So in grace, the power of regeneration, or to produce a new birth is not inherent in man. The power which brings forth this new birth is yet more remote from man than that which produces the natural birth.

If, then, in the natural world the child is born without any knowledge or consciousness of itself, and consequently without any faith on its part; and after it is born remains yet for a long time in a state of utter helpless dependence receiving its nourishment and its protection and tutorage from the mother who gave it birth, will it be a very unreasonable thing to predicate as much of the kingdom of grace? May we not look for, and hope that the laws in the kingdom of grace which are under the immediate superintendence of the Holy Ghost,

will do the work in their sphere without our assistance? To doubt this would be to doubt the power of the Almighty. The will of God, and the power of God is by no means dependent on man, in the government of the natural or physical world. All things here are dictated by His counsel, and accomplish His divine purpose. Hence, inasmuch as the entire plan of salvation with all the means of grace is a gift of God's own free will, purely out of love, and is effective only in so far as it is guided by the power of the Spirit, can there be anything very strange if this same love thus manifested toward adults would comprehend the whole human family, and hence also include infants and bring them into the ark of safety by the sacrament of baptism even before they are eight days old?

It will be admitted that whatever change baptism will bring about even in the adult, is produced by the power of the Spirit, and that he who is thus baptized must be entirely passive in the hands of God. So far as self is concerned he must be as though he were not, or in other words he must become as a little child in order to be a fit subject for baptism. Why not then be baptized while we are yet little children? For we must not lose sight of the fact, that it is by grace we are saved, through faith, and that not of ourselves, but that it is the gift of God.

Again, it is admitted that baptism, even of adults, is the only way by which we are received as members of the visible Church. And then it is also admitted that the means of grace as well as the Holy Ghost are granted to the visible Church only, and that the believer can, therefore, have no part in the grace and Spirit of God only in so far as he is a member of the visible Church. Indeed, there is no invisible Church, or spiritual kingdom, only in the visible. Hence, it necessarily follows that if we forbid the baptism of infants, and thus exclude them from the visible Church, that we thereby also exclude them from the Church triumphant, because it is only through the outer porch that we can enter the most holy.

So much account is also made of the fact, that, as it is said there is no positive command in the Bible to baptize children,

no, "*thus saith the Lord.*" Where would those literal interpreters of the Bible land if they would insist upon applying the same rule to all the most important doctrines of our holy religion as taught in the Scriptures? Let them show the "*thus saith the Lord,*" for the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the communion of women, or even the very favorite doctrine that none but adults should be baptized? And then on the other hand, if such a literal interpretation is claimed as the only correct interpretation, then we are compelled to adopt the notion of St. Anthony, and preach the gospel to the fish in the waters, and to the wild beasts of the forest, for we are commanded to preach the gospel to every *creature*. It is, however, a very peculiar freak which sometimes lays hold upon some interpreters of the Bible. That part which serves their purpose best by a literal interpretation, does of course not admit of any other meaning, while that part which by a literal interpretation would subvert their fancied theory is susceptible of almost any interpretation to suit circumstances.

But in addition to the teachings of the Bible we have

#### HISTORY,

which appeals less to our faith and more to our reason as to its meaning. Here a literal interpretation may serve the purpose for all.

Much account is made by those who renounce infant baptism, of Tertullian, a man of some notoriety as a reformer in a certain direction, and also well known in church history. He was a teacher in Africa, living in the end of the second, and beginning of the third centuries. While it is acknowledged that he was a man of ability as a teacher, it must not be overlooked that he was a strong believer in the Montanistic notions, which as a matter of course must greatly disqualify him as an impartial exponent of the true subject for baptism. Those who hold him up as the great mouth-piece of anti-pedobaptism see him only on the side which seems to them to be against infant baptism,

but there is another side very apparent which goes much farther in favor of infant baptism. The truth is that Tertullian opposed infant baptism because he believed that it was divinely commanded, and was fully convinced that it was practiced by the Apostles, and all the apostolic church fathers, and hence rested on the most unequivocal authority of the Church; this he did not deny.

Dr. Schaff, a man well known in the theological world says, "Tertullian is aware that the practice of the whole church is against him, and he comes out, though unsuccessfully, as a reformer. Had he been able to appeal to antiquity, and to oppose infant baptism as an innovation, he would certainly have taken advantage of this position. But he does not question the apostolic origin of this ordinance, nor even its propriety and legality."

He readily acknowledges the validity of infant baptism and makes no attempt to say any thing against it on that account. His views in this respect are altogether on the side of infant baptism. The reason of his opposition lies in an entirely different direction. He claimed that baptism was regeneration, and that through the act of baptism all past sins were forgiven, and he believed also that any sins committed after baptism could never be forgiven. His peculiar notions swung him thus pendulum-wise to the opposite extreme; that baptism should be deferred until so late in life that there could be no more time to commit sin before death. This conclusion is very good if his premises are true.

Tertullian was however not the only one who claimed this doctrine; it gained considerable notoriety, and was maintained by, otherwise, distinguished men. Constantine the Great and first Christian emperor was one of its disciples, and was therefore not baptized until just before his death. Hence, although Constantine favored Christianity and gave the Christians considerable latitude as emperor, it cannot be claimed that Constantine the man was a Christian before his baptism. Whatever objections, therefore, he may have had to infant baptism previous to his own baptism are the opinion of a

heathen, and are consequently not entitled to any authority in matters pertaining to the doctrines of the Christian church.

Augustine, another disciple of the same school, and a man whose name, in consequence of his position in the church, is embalmed in Church history; and although he is numbered with Tertullian and Constantine as being of the same faith, we yet hear him say, "It had been better if I had been taken under the motherly care of the Church in tender youth."

It is indeed a very strange fact, that although these men are opposed to infant baptism, yet we do not hear one of them even hint that it is wrong, or that it has not the sanction of the Church. Nor do they ever say a word about rebaptizing those who were baptized in their childhood. Even Tertullian himself, who claims to be the author of this new departure, really admits its validity. It is very evident that they all felt satisfied that the spirit of the age then, as well as the covenant of the whole Jewish economy, was against them.

We can ask no better evidence that infant baptism was very extensively, if not universally practiced, in the days of Tertullian, than the fact that he opposed its practice. If it had not been a fixed fact in the Church, and deeply rooted in the hearts of the Christians as a divinely instituted sacrament, he could not have entertained the idea of becoming a reformer. For it is a fact very obvious that the main object which he had in opposing infant baptism was not from a conscientious conviction that it was wrong; but a selfish desire to immortalize his name and make it conspicuous in history after he himself should be no more. In this he succeeded. But where conscience and truth can be sold for so small a sum there is but little to be expected in defence or support of any subject. In all such cases self is of much more importance than truth. Tertullian evidently treated this subject with great levity, hence we hear him say, "the man who is born by water and the Spirit is like a fish, because both are born in water."

Neander, the great Church historian, is also claimed by the Baptists as authority over against infant baptism. Much account

is made of what he says in his comments on Paul in 1 Corinthians, vii. 14. "The view here taken by Paul," says Neander, "though it goes against the actual existence of infant baptism at that time, yet includes the fundamental idea from which infant baptism was afterwards necessarily developed, and by which it would be justified in the mind of Paul." Now it must be remembered that this is the idea which Neander had in regard to Paul's meaning in this text. But how he can see that Paul's views "go against the actual existence of infant baptism *at that time*" is difficult to comprehend from the text itself. I admit that it is hard to understand the exact meaning of Paul's words. It is however much easier to see what he *does not* teach, than to understand what he does teach. How he can say that "the view here taken by Paul goes against infant baptism, or that it includes the fundamental idea from which infant baptism was afterwards necessarily developed" is, to say the least, difficult to understand. We can not see how he gets the idea that Paul makes any allusion to infant baptism, unless it be that the brother who has an unbelieving wife, and the wife who has an unbelieving husband shall not put them away, lest their children would become unclean and thus become unfit subjects for baptism. If we could agree with Neander, that infant baptism is not primarily comprehended as a sacrament, and as such clearly understood by the Apostles, already at the birth of the Church on the day of Pentecost, we should have our serious doubts as to its divine authority. Because to introduce any thing of such vital importance, and so far reaching in its consequences, by the Apostles, or any of the Church fathers, subsequent to the birth of the Church, might well be regarded as an innovation. But we can not see anything in the language of Paul, either expressed or implied, that "goes against the actual existence of infant baptism *at that time*."

Again, much account is made about the silence of Church history on this subject. We are told that history says nothing about infant baptism till the close of the second century. If this be true, and if the opposition have the testimony to show it,

it would be an easy matter to tell us by whom and under what particular circumstances it was first introduced. A subject that has caused so much controversy must surely have a beginning, and be known among the Church historians if, as it is claimed, it is an innovation. Historians are very ready to give us dates and authors of other notions and heresies which from time to time crept into the Church. It is well known that no such beginning of infant baptism ever took place in the second or third centuries as an innovation, or we should long since have been referred to it.

The opposition do not deny that under the old dispensation the children of believing parents were in the covenant; hence we have a right to ask, and in order to maintain their position they must show when, if ever, they were taken out. There are two points which when clearly shown will forever settle the question of infant baptism. The reasons why there is so little said in Church history about infant baptism before the days of Tertullian are, first on account of the shortness of the time. From the death of John to the birth of Tertullian there were only about sixty years. And second, because the Apostles were missionaries. Their labor from first to last was traveling and preaching and organizing congregations. This, of course, first of all, required that they teach and make disciples of the parents by baptizing them. It was not the office of the Apostles to write a history of all their labors as individual ministers of the gospel. The Acts of the Apostles, and a few epistles comprehending just so much as was necessary to show the divine and human nature of Christ; and the firm establishment of the divine authority of the gospel, is all they wrote. But it must not be supposed that this comprehended all that the Apostles did during the time they labored as ministers of the gospel. There is comparatively but little of the labor and teaching of Christ recorded. And John says in regard to it, "There are also many other things which Jesus did, which if they should be written every one, I suppose that the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."

Our foreign missionaries now, for the most part keep a record of what they are doing, and yet when we read the reports of their labors we seldom find any mention made of the number of children they baptized.

And then again, we must remember that the art of writing and printing books, in those days did not employ its millions of men and means as it does now. They did not have a score of reporters to follow them, according to the modern style of the self-constituted evangelists, who for filthy lucre's sake report almost every word they speak. Nor was electricity then, as now, the servant of man to take up a sermon or an essay and carry it around the globe in almost the same time it escapes the speaker's lips. The many facilities for writing and communicating which the arts and sciences have furnished for us, existed only prospectively then.

Again, if we have nothing positively in favor of infant baptism written by the Apostles, we have also nothing directly or indirectly against it. And inasmuch as infant Church membership existed long before the time of the Apostles, and with the full knowledge of it by the Apostles, and as there never was any divine command or act to annul it, the very strong presumption here is in favor of infant baptism being practiced by the Apostles. And then, we have circumstantial evidence in history which shows beyond a doubt, that the Apostles regarded infant baptism as a divinely instituted sacrament. And in a decision of one of Pennsylvania's most distinguished judges on the supreme bench, he gives it as his opinion, that an unbroken chain of circumstantial evidence is the best evidence that can be had, especially in criminal cases; because crime committed against the authority of law is presumed to have been committed clandestinely, where pretended positive evidence was always looked upon with more or less suspicion.

John, the evangelist and beloved disciple of Jesus died about the year of our Lord one hundred. Polycarp, one of his disciples and scholars, was born in the year seventy, and hence was about thirty years of age when John his spiritual father died.

Being therefore already of mature age at the death of John, and was evidently fully indoctrinated in the Apostolic doctrine; he died in the year 155, five years before the birth of Tertullian. It is a fact well known to the Church that Polycarp was one of the ablest and most devoted apostolic Church fathers and teachers. And being a scholar of John it is but natural to conclude that he imbibed the spirit of his master, and continued in the same theological channel into which he was conducted by his teacher, so that the teaching of Polycarp may readily be supposed to be the same that John taught. And as he was bishop of Smyrna he exerted a deep and wide-felt influence upon the Church.

Cotemporary with Polycarp we have Justin Martyr, born 105, and Irenæus, born 120, all numbered among the apostolic Church fathers. Justin Martyr was therefore 50, and Irenæus 85 years old when Polycarp died, and were also contemporaries with Tertullian.

Now then we have this chain of circumstances linked together in such a way as to show beyond a doubt that the views of infant baptism which Tertullian labored to put away were received from John. Hence inasmuch as infant baptism was extensively practiced in the time of Tertullian, and this is readily admitted, even by the opposition; it follows that if it was not introduced during the apostolic period and practiced by John, that it must have been introduced during the sixty years immediately preceding Tertullian, by the church fathers whose teaching was received from John, and therefore has still the apostolic authority. But assuming this horn of the dilemma, the time is too short for it to have gained such extensive practice with almost universal favor.

But, if it was not introduced on the day of Pentecost, or by the Apostles in the first century, will the opposition tell us at what time and by whom it was first introduced? Was this subject of so much importance, and which has produced so much controversy, entirely still-born? The very fact that such men as Irenæus, Polycarp, and Justin Martyr do not say anything

at all against infant baptism, when we know that it was so extensively practiced in the Church in their day is of itself most conclusive evidence that it had the sanction of the Church; and that the spirit of the age was entirely with it. Whatever reference is made to it by any of these Church fathers is always for and never against it.

Had it been looked upon as an innovation in the Church, Irenæus would not have said, "that Christ became a child for children, a youth for the youth, and a man for men, so that he might thus sanctify every stage and condition of our life from infancy to manhood."

And again, another instance found in Church history, showing the early practice of infant baptism is in the case of Origen of Alexandria. He was born 185, twenty-five years after the birth of Tertullian, and died 254. Tertullian died aged sixty years, hence he and Origen lived thirty-five years cotemporaneous. Origen says of himself that he was baptized soon after his birth, "and that regeneration originates and has its beginning in baptism." And what is of still greater force coming from a man like Origen, living in the second and third centuries is when he says, "The Church has received it from the Apostles, that they should allow baptism to little ones." In all his writing Origen speaks of infant baptism as something universally acknowledged in the Church, and handed down to her from the Apostles.

Clement, a bishop of Rome from the year 91 to 101, who, it is claimed, was the third bishop of Rome after the Apostle Peter, and who is beyond a doubt the Clement mentioned by the Apostle Paul, in Philippians; gives us some unmistakable hints in a letter written to the Church at Corinth, which shows that infant baptism was then already an undisputed fact in the Church. Living in the days of the Apostles and being collaborators with, at least some of them, these Church-fathers say but little about infant baptism for the same reason that the Apostles speak so little about it. But instead of turning this to an account, as an argument against infant baptism, it goes

much farther in showing its divine authority. Enough is said, both by them and the Apostles to show that it was practiced among them, and hence their almost entire silence shows that there was no opposition to it till after about the middle of the second century.

Whatever objection may have existed to infant baptism previous to the middle of the third century could at most have been only in the way of individual opinion, and not by any ecclesiastical authority. It is evident from the action of the council of Carthage in the year 246 that the subject of infant baptism as to its divine authority was no longer a question; and this council was held only about 140 years after the death of the last apostle. And the question at this meeting was not whether children should be baptized; but whether they should be baptized before they were eight days old. The question discussed before this council also brings to view another important fact on this subject. Their whole action is based upon the assumption that infant baptism in the Christian Church is the antitype of which circumcision in the Jewish Church was the type. And as this command was to be observed when the child was eight days old, it became a question with some, whether the age for baptism should not be the same.

Then there is also something very significant in our Lord's affection for little children, and in the rebuke He gave those who would debar them from the household of faith, by forbidding them to be brought to Him. When the Apostles disputed among themselves as to who should be greatest in the kingdom of heaven, the Saviour called a little child and set it in the midst of them and said, " Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven." The Apostles still had an idea that Christ would establish an earthly kingdom, one, that like the heathen world, would need civil officers; and as they had already been selected to fill certain stations in the church, they expected that they would still be favored above the rest of their Jewish brethren. Hence their dispute as to who among them should be greatest in His kingdom.

The little child which Christ set in the midst of them was intended in the first place as a rebuke to the disciples ; but it was also to serve more than a mere rebuke. The words of our Lord, "except ye become as little children," imply much more. Instead of little children becoming adults to fit them for the kingdom of heaven, as we are told ; adults must again become little children, just as the child is entirely passive in the hands of the mother, and subject to her will, without having any authority of its own. So all adults, in order to enter the kingdom of heaven must divest themselves of everything that they may seem to claim as self; and become passive in the hand of God, and entirely subject to the authority of the church as their spiritual mother. Whether young or old in years therefore, in order to become proper subjects for baptism they must be little children. There is really no baptism acknowledged as valid by the Saviour but in the spirit of a little child.

It matters not therefore how much infant baptism may be ignored, Christ has so ordained, that as the natural life must begin by being born into the world as infants, so the new and spiritual life in the kingdom of heaven must begin by being born into it as infants, by water and the Spirit. As the spiritual life therefore only begins in baptism, and as there can be no new and spiritual birth without it, all who reject infant baptism and are baptized in adult years must go back again into childhood in order to be born into the kingdom of heaven by water and the Spirit. Because there is no other baptism than that of infant baptism.

There is evidently, not only a great inconsistency ; but also a great contradiction on the part of those who reject infant baptism. They claim, with us that baptism is a divinely instituted sacrament, and as such is essential to salvation, but also claim that an infant cannot be baptized, and yet admit that there is salvation in those churches whose members were baptized while yet infants. The very fact of their yielding this point frustrates their entire structure ; to this dilemma they are driven by their own inconsistency. To be consistent with them-

selves they must admit that infant baptism is valid, or that there is no salvation only in the anti-pedobaptist Church, and that consequently the millions of members of other churches who were baptized in their infancy, during the Christian dispensation, are all lost. This is the logical conclusion consequent upon their premises.

---

#### ART. VI.—THE P'SHITO VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY PROF. F. A. GAST, D. D.

---

THE oldest and most important Syriac version of the Old Testament is that which is commonly called the *P'shito*.\* When this name was first applied it is impossible to say. It was certainly not given originally by the translators themselves; for Ephraem Syrus, who died 378 A. D., when speaking of this Syriac version which he is comparing with the Hebrew text, simply calls it "our version." The name most probably dates from a considerably later time, when other Syriac translations were in current use. Bar Hebræus, who died 1286, A. D., employs this name in the preface to his *Horreum Mysteriorum*; and it has been generally supposed that it originated with him. But this is a mistake; for it is found already in the Massoretic MSS. of the ninth or tenth century.†

The word *P'shito* signifies *simple*. It is the *peal* passive participle of *P'shita*, which in Aramaic means to *unfold* or *spread out* that which was folded up. The verb in a reflexive form occurs in this sense, for example, in the account of the woman who had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, who "was bowed

\* More properly, *P'shit'ho*, fem. gender, emphatic state, agreeing with *mopag'ho*, *version*.

† *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Band xxxii, p. 589.

together, and could in no wise lift up herself" (Syriac, "could not straighten herself at all"), but who, when Jesus laid His hands on her, was immediately "made straight" (Luke xiii. 11 and 13). *P'shito*, then, denotes what is *simple* as opposed to what is *double* or *folded up*; as when servants are enjoined to obey their masters "in singleness of heart" (Syriac, "with a simple heart"), Col. iii. 22. When employed, as it here is, to designate a version it can only mean that the version is simple in the sense of being *literal* and *faithful*.

Bertholdt,\* therefore, is certainly in error when he maintains that the word *P'shito*, as here used, is equivalent in signification to the Greek,  $\delta\eta\chiων\eta$ , and the Latin *vulgata*, and denotes that the version was *widely spread*, and in *general use* among the Syrian Christians. Neither the Syriac word nor the corresponding Chaldee  $\sigma\pi\omega\sigma$  ever bears this sense. It is employed rather to describe the *character* of this version in distinction from certain others, either in the Syriac or in other languages.

Bar Hebræus seems in one place † to take the word in the sense of *plain*, *unadorned*, *lacking rhetorical elegance*; but he is given to disparaging this version because, for one thing, its language, which is not the classical Syriac to which he was accustomed in writers like Jacob of Edessa, offended his refined taste.

There is more to be said in favor of Tregelles' opinion, ‡ which is also the opinion of Nöldeke, § that the name *P'shito* was given to this version to distinguish it from the Syro-Hexaplar, which was made from Origen's revised text of the LXX. In the column of the Hexapla devoted to the LXX, Origen wrote down the current Greek text, while at the same time he indicated, by various signs, the difference between it and the He-

\* *Einleitung*, ii. p. 593.

† *Hist. Dynast.* p. 100, quoted by Arnold in Hertzog's *Real Encyclopädie*, Art. *Syrische Bibelübersetzungen*.

‡ Smith's Dict. of Bible, Art. *Versions Ancient (Syriac)*, p. 3383 f.

§ *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Band xxxii. p. 589.

brew text. When the LXX contained anything not found in the Hebrew, he retained it, indeed, but marked the addition by placing an *obelus* before and two points after; and when the LXX lacked what stood in the Hebrew, he supplied the omission from the other Greek versions of Theodotion, Aquila and Symmachus, but pointed out the inserted words by placing an *asterisk* before and two points after. This corrected Hexaplar Greek text was translated into Syriac in the beginning of the seventh century by Paul of Tela, a Monophysite, who not only followed the Greek word for word, but also retained the critical signs introduced by Origen and the references to the other Greek versions; so that every page was covered with *asterisks*, and *obeli*, and other marks. From all this the old Syriac version, made from the original Hebrew, was free; and such a bare text as it presented, in contrast to the Syro-Hexaplar version, might naturally be designated *the simple*.

It is more probable, however, that it was so named, because it is a literal translation, faithful to the orginal and free from allegorical and mystical explanations. So, according to Buxtorf,\* סְמִינָה signifies among the Rabbins, to *explain or interpret in a simple, literal manner*; סְמִינָה, as a substantive, signifies *the simple or literal explanation or sense*; and סְמִינָה which corresponds in Chaldee to the Syriac *p'shit*, denotes what is *simple*, as opposed to what is *bent, double or composite*; or as a substantive, *simplicity*, the simple, literal sense of Scripture, as distinguished from the שְׁרָה, the allegorical and mystical sense.

It would seem from this that *P'shito* cannot signify anything

\* Lexicon Chaldaicum, Talmudicum et Rabbinicum, Col. 1861: סְמִינָה, simpli-  
citer, literaliter, et proprie juxta literam scriptam explicare vel interpretari. סְמִינָה,  
simplicitas, simplex et literalis explicatio vel sensus alicujus loci, doctrina, vel textus.  
סְמִינָה extensum (rectum, aquum) simplex, cuius opositionem סְבִירָה curvum, tor-  
tuosum, sive לְבִזָּה, duplex, sive כְּוַיָּה, compositum; substantive, simplicitas, sim-  
plex, literalis sensus Scriptura, cui opponitur שְׁרָה, allegoricus et mysticus  
sensus.

else in this connection than *simple* in the sense of *literal*. Geiger, indeed, objects that **כְּבָד** never has this meaning in the Mishnah and Jerusalem Gemara, though he admits that it does have it often in the Babylonian Gemara, and commonly in the later Rabbins. The objection, however, is without force, inasmuch as the title *P'shito* was probably not given to this version until a considerable time after the editing of the Babylonian Gemara, about 450 or 500 A. D.

This version stands in marked contrast to the Targums, which are paraphrases rather than translations; so that even the oldest and best, the Targum of Onkelos, does not hesitate to make alterations that it may avoid anthropomorphisms and not bring God into too close contact with man.\* In distinction from these and other free versions which must have been known to the Syrian Christians, the old Syriac version is rightly named the *P'shito*, inasmuch as, while it is not slavishly literal, it faithfully reproduces the verbal sense, with only very rare explanatory additions.

This version did not originally contain the Apocryphal books, one proof among many that it was immediately translated from the Hebrew Canon from which these books were excluded. The most of them, however, were translated at a later time into Syriac from the LXX; some as early as the latter half of the fourth century, since Ephraem Syrus quotes them, though not as Scripture; while others, as the books of Maccabees and the additions to Daniel, were not yet extant in the Syriac in Ephraem's day, nor even somewhat later in the time of Polychronius, about 410 A. D.†

On the other hand, it included all the Canonical books. The order, however, in which it arranges them is peculiar, differing from the order both of the Hebrew original and of the Septuagint translation. It is not the same in all the MSS.; but the usual arrangement is that given by Lee in his edition: *Vetus*

\* See Deutsch's Article on the *Targums*, republished in his *Literary Remains* from Smith's Dict. of the Bible.

† Bleek's *Introduction to the Old Testament*, English translation, vol. ii. p. 444.

Testamentum Syriace, eos tantum libros sistens qui in Canone Hebraico habentur, *ordine vero, quoad fieri potuit, apud Syros usitato dispositos.* The order is this: the Pentateuch; the Book of Job; Joshua; Judges; the two Books of Samuel; the two Books of Kings; the two Books of Chronicles; the Psalms; Proverbs; Ecclesiastes; Ruth; Canticles; Esther; Ezra; Nehemiah; Isaiah; the twelve minor Prophets in the order of the Hebrew; Jeremiah; Ezekiel and Daniel.

This is very singular. It is surprising that the Syriac translators set aside the order of the Hebrew from which they were immediately translating. They made no threefold division of the books, such as we find both in the original and in the Greek version. The principle of arrangement in the Septuagint is perfectly clear; for this version follows the order of subjects, the historical books constituting the first division, the poetical, the second, and the prophetical, the third. The principle of arrangement in the Hebrew into the Law, the Prophets and the Hagiographa, is more obscure and has been variously explained. But for the order in the Syriac it is simply impossible to give a satisfactory reason. There is no apparent principle. The books are not arranged chronologically, nor according to subjects, nor in the order of their relative importance.

Still, we cannot believe that the Syriac translators, after rejecting the order they found in the Hebrew Canon, proceeded to rearrange arbitrarily. They must have been guided by some controlling principle, though we may not now be able to discover it. The position of the book of Job is remarkable; but perhaps it is due to the fact that the translators believed it to be either pre-Mosaic, or at least Mosaic, in its origin; and as it could not well stand before the Pentateuch, it was placed immediately after. The order of the books from Joshua to Chronicles is natural; only we should expect to find the book of Ruth following the book of Judges, of which it forms a kind of appendix, like the two narratives in Judges xvii.-xxi., whereas we actually find it between the two poetical books of Ecclesiastes-

tes and Canticles; and moreover, we should expect to find Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther after the books of Chronicles with which they are closely connected, while in fact they stand after Canticles and before Isaiah. Why, too, should the Twelve Minor Prophets have their place after Isaiah, rather than after Ezekiel, as in the Hebrew? There is much in this arrangement that is quite obscure.

The early origin of this version cannot be questioned. The native traditions, as given by Bar-Hebræus in the 13th century, all assign to it an extremely early date. Some say that it was made already in the reign of Solomon at the request of Hiram, King of Tyre; others, that Asa, the priest, translated it when he was sent by the King of Assyria to Samaria; and still others, that it had its origin in the days of the Apostle Thaddeus (Adai) and of Abgar, King of Edessa.\* These opinions, or at least the first two, are fabulous. The first, which wisely limits the number of books translated for the benefit of Hiram to the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, and Job, rests on the supposition that the Tyrian King was a convert to the religion of Israel, and therefore needed the Written Word. But unfortunately, being a Phœnician, and speaking a dialect much more nearly related to the Hebrew than to the Syriac, he could have read the original far more easily than the translation, which, besides, contains a number of Greek words whose presence in a version made in the days of Solomon would be unaccountable.

The second opinion, that the translation was made for the benefit of the Samaritans, is no less absurd; since any translation in the Syriac language would have been quite unintelligible to them. Perhaps this opinion is in some way connected with the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch. "As that version is in an Aramæan dialect, any one who supposed that it was made immediately after the mission of the priest from Assyria might say that it was then first that an Aramean

\* See Carpzov, *Critica Sacra*, p. 623.

translation was executed; and this might afterwards, in a sort of indefinite manner, have been connected with what the Syrians themselves used." \*

It is not at all probable that any part of the Old Testament was translated into Syriac before the Christian era. Some of the older scholars, indeed, maintained that it was, and sought proof of this position in the frequent agreement of the LXX. with the *P'shito*, and in the fact that Paul's quotation of Ps. lxviii. 19, (Q.V., v. 18), is in accord with the Syriac, but not with the Hebrew or the Greek. The facts are correct, but the inference drawn from them, that both the Apostle and the Seventy had the *P'shito* version before them, is invalid. The points of agreement between the Greek and the Syriac versions can be better accounted for by supposing, either that the Syriac translators made use of the LXX., or, what is more probable, that their version was at a later time revised according to the LXX. And as for Paul's citation (Eph. iv. 8), it must be observed that the Syriac and the Chaldee agree in the rendering, " thou hast given gifts unto men," so that in all likelihood both Paul and the Syriac translators have here followed some early Targum.

But may we not believe that this version was made in the Apostolic age? Such is the universal tradition of the Syrian Christians as regards the New Testament, and we have every reason to think that the Old Testament was translated about the same time as the New. However, so early an origin of the New Testament version, is, apart from other considerations, hardly reconcilable with the history of the Canon. There are no good grounds for dating the *P'shito* version, whether of the Old Testament or of the New, prior to the middle of the 2d century.

But we cannot well place it much later. The first certain historical proof of its existence is the fact that Ephraem Syrus in the 4th century quotes from and comments on the sacred books as found in this version. It was certainly widely current

\* Smith's Dict. of Bible, p. 3384.

in his day, for he finds it necessary to explain many of its words which had already become antiquated.\* This fact carries us back at least into the 3d century. But we cannot stop here; for there was a series of theologians in Syria with a body of Christian literature extending back from Ephraem to Bardesanes in the latter half of the 2d century. "Now, such able theologians and such a Christian literature could not have existed without a knowledge of the Scriptures; and yet, through all this period, we have no intimation that the Aramaean churches lacked the Holy Scriptures in their vernacular tongue. We therefore infer that the *P'shito* version existed and was in common use from at least as early as the latter part of the 2d century."†

Certainly it was in existence and had received ecclesiastical sanction long before the Syrian Church broke up into its several sects; and when we reflect that Nestorian and Monophysite, Melchite and Maronite, all received it unhesitatingly as the authorized version, we may be sure with the great body of scholars to-day, that it originated not later certainly than the first half of the 3d century, and probably as early as the latter half of the 2d.

The place where, is quite as uncertain as the time when, this version was made. Antioch has been regarded as the home of its birth, especially by those older scholars who assign its date to the Apostolic age. That city was the capital of all Syria and one of the most important centers of Christianity; and it has been thought, that on this account it possessed greater advantages than any other place for producing a correct Syriac translation of the Bible. But since Michaelis this view has been generally set aside, partly because the traditions of the Syrian Christians respecting the origin of this version never point to Antioch, and partly because in that city the Greek

\* Wiseman in his *Hora Syriaca* gives many examples. See also Smith's Dict. of Bible, p. 3386.

† Murdock, *Translation of the Syriac Testament*, Appendix ii. p. 491.

language was in current use, so that no necessity existed for a Syriac translation either of the Old Testament or of the New.

There is a stronger probability in favor of Edessa. Edessa was the principal seat of the Church and learning of the Syrians. There Christianity was very early established, and thence it spread to the eastern parts of Asia. For a long period Edessa was the eastern metropolis of the Christian world, and its language was the purest Syriac. What more likely than that the need of a version of the Bible in the Syrian tongue should be early felt and met?

Against this view several objections have been brought. *First*, that Jacob of Edessa who died 698 A.D., says, in a passage quoted by Bar-Hebraeus, that the translators were sent to Palestine by the Apostle Thaddeus and Abgar, King of Edessa, so that, if this statement be true, the version was not made in any part of Syria; *Secondly*, that this tradition is confirmed by the undeniable dependence of the *P'shito* on the Jewish Palestinian interpretation; and *thirdly*, that the inelegance of the language of this version proves that it was not made in Edessa where the purest classical Syriac was spoken.

These objections, however, have little force. As to the first, it only needs to be remarked that the tradition is a late one, and is contradicted by other traditions found in Syriac writers. The affinity between this version and the earlier Targums cannot be questioned; but it is easily explained, if the translators were, as we have every reason to believe they were, Jewish Christians, who would naturally be influenced by expositions with which they had been familiar from childhood. And in regard to the lack of elegance or polish with which the version has been reproached, that may be greatly exaggerated by writers like Bar-Hebraeus, who contrasts\* the *P'shito* unfavorably with the LXX.; and if not exaggerated, may be readily accounted for on the supposition that the early Christians of

\* As quoted by Asseman, he says: *Simplicem Syrorum versionem rudem esse, rāv LXX. vero exactam et numeris omnibus absolutam.*

Syria, as elsewhere, were not in general of the higher cultivated classes. It is most probable, therefore, that the version was made in Edessa.

But by whom? However it may have been with the New Testament, there can be no doubt that the translation of the Old Testament is the work of several hands. Such was the tradition in the Syrian Church. Ephraem Syrus on Josh. xv. 28, speaks of *translatores*. And this is confirmed by the character of the version. According to the judgment of those who have examined the subject most closely, the tone of the translation is not the same throughout. In some of the books, the Syriac style is pure; in others, it is full of barbarisms. Ecclesiastes and Canticles must have proceeded from one whose vernacular was the Chaldee; for he introduces Chaldaisms into his translation, rendering, for example, by *yoth*, which is no Syriac word, the Hebrew sign of the accusative *וְ*, as the Chaldee does by *וְ*.\*

But is the *P'shito* of Jewish or of Christian origin? The Jewish origin of the Old Testament version was maintained already by Richard Simon in 1685, and more lately with great learning and acumen by Perles in an inaugural Dissertation, 1860, partly because so extensive a knowledge of Hebrew cannot be supposed in the early Syrian Church, and partly because traces of Jewish Palestinian influences are frequently betrayed. But in reply it is sufficient to say that, according to Josephus, the Jews were numerous in Syria, and that, doubtless, many of these were early converted to Christianity. We have only to suppose that the translators were Jewish Christians, and we at once account for their knowledge of Hebrew, and their familiarity and use of Jewish interpretations. Moreover, what motive could there have been, before the spread of Christianity, for Jews, acquainted with the original of the Old Testament, to

\* Eichhorn, *Einleitung ins Alte Testament*, § 250. However this same *yoth* is found also in Gen. i. 1, which verse Eichhorn conjectures (§ 249) was borrowed by the Syriac translator from some earlier version. The word does not occur again in the Pentateuch.

render it into Syriac? The need of such a version would hardly have been felt among the Syrians before the advent of our Lord, whereas the primitive Church, prior to the collection of the Canon, was everywhere dependent on the Old Testament Scriptures.

That the authors were not Jews is evident from the entire character of the work. It is a close translation, not a paraphrase. Compare the *P'shito* with any of the Targums, and observe its faithfulness to the original text, its freedom from explanatory glosses, its reproduction of anthropomorphisms. Clearly this manner of rendering is not Jewish. A Jew in that age would have followed the existing Chaldee paraphrases as his model; nor would he have exhibited the negligence and awkwardness in translating the Levitical laws which Hirzel \* charges upon the Syriac translators of the Pentateuch.

Besides, is it probable that a version of purely Jewish origin would have acquired such authority among the Syrian Christians, as to be accepted without question by all sects and parties? The citations made by our Lord and His Apostles in the New Testament agree in general, not with the Syriac, but with the Greek version of the Old Testament. Is it not likely that this discrepancy between the Syriac Testaments would have been set down to the fact, if it was a fact, that the Old Testament translation was the production of a Jew? Indeed, was not this belief of a supposed Jewish authorship of the *P'shito* one of the chief grounds of the unfavorable opinion entertained of it by Bar-Hebræus?

But of its Christian, or rather Jewish Christian origin, we have positive proof in the version itself. We have no reference now to the superscriptions, or subscriptions, or other matter lying outside of the text itself. These not only differ widely in the several MSS. and editions, but often betray a comparatively late Christian hand. For instance, the book of Job, which immediately follows the Pentateuch, is superscribed:

\* Hirzel, *De Pentat. vers. Syr. indele*, p. 127 seq.

"The Book of Job. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, one God, we begin to write the book of Job, the righteous,"\*—a title that could have emanated only from an orthodox Christian, who lived after the Trinitarian controversies. This is true, too, of many of the superscriptions in the Syriac Psalter, which are altogether unlike those in the Massoretic and LXX. text. The superscription of Ps. vii., for example, runs thus: "Of David. The conversion of the Gentiles to the faith and the confession of the Trinity." Manifestly such titles are of later date than the version itself, and cannot, therefore, be adduced in proof of its Christian origin.

We turn to the text itself, and ask what rendering it gives of the Messianic passages? An instance or two must suffice.

According to the Massoretic pointing Psalm cx. 8, must be translated: *Thy people are free will offerings* (*i. e.* offer themselves willingly) *in the day of Thy power* (or of thy host), *in the splendors of holiness*, (or, according to another reading, 'בְּרִיאָה, on the mountains of holiness, instead of בְּרִיאָה); from the womb of the dawn Thou hast the dew of Thy youth. The second half, with which alone we are here concerned, the Syriac translates: *In the splendor of holiness have I begotten Thee a child from the womb of old.* Instead of בְּרִיאָה, *thy youth*, it read בְּרִיאָה, *I have begotten thee*; instead of בְּרִיאָה, *the dawn*, it read בְּרִיאָה, *from the dawn, with the meaning of old*; and instead of בְּלִיל, *dew*, it must have read, בְּנֵי, *child, boy, or at least have confounded the former with the latter, which it renders talyo.* And thus we have in the *P'shito* translation of this verse the Christian doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son.

Another instance in which the Christian theological standpoint of the Syriac translator seems to be clearly apparent, is his rendering of בְּרִיאָה Ps. ii. 12. The English version gives: *Kiss the Son;* but the difficulties in the way of this rendering

\* The references to the *P'shito* in this article are to Lee's edition, the only text at present accessible to the writer.

are many and well known. The word **בָּן**, in the sense of *Son*, is not Hebrew, but Aramaic. It is strange that it should be found in this Psalm, which springs from the best period of Hebrew literature; strange that it should be found nowhere else in the Old Testament, except in Prov. xxxi. 2, which is unquestionably of late date and marked by other Aramaisms; and stranger still, that in the same Psalm there should occur two words for *son*, the one Hebrew, the other Chaldee. Besides this, the absence of the article from **בָּן** and the change of subject create difficulty. It is not surprising, therefore, that this translation, *Kiss the Son*, is not found in any of the ancient versions, with the single exception of the *P'shiṭo*. The Targum renders: *Receive instruction*; the LXX. *δράσθε παιδείας*; the Vulgate, *apprehendite disciplinam*—all taking **בָּן** as a noun. Others, as Aquila, Symmachus and Jerome, regarding **בָּן** as an adverb, render *adorate pure*. The Syriac alone gives, *kiss the Son*,—a rendering that is most easily accounted for by supposing that the translator was a Christian, who desired to find in this manifestly Messianic Psalm an additional Messianic allusion.

The *P'shiṭo* was evidently made from the original Hebrew. Such is the direct testimony of Ephraem Syrus, and it is confirmed by an examination of the character of the version, which conforms closely in the main to the Massoretic text.

There are many points of similarity, however, between this Syriac version and some of the Targums. This is true especially of the Targum on Proverbs. Certain linguistic and other characteristics, according to Deutsch, lead to the conclusion that its birth-place is most likely Syria. It comes nearer to the idea of a version than almost any other Targum, except, perhaps, that of Onkelos, adhering, as it does, closely to the original text. “The most remarkable feature about it, however, and one that has given rise to endless speculations and discussions, is its extraordinary similarity to the Syriac version. It would, indeed, sometimes seem as if they had copied each other—an opinion warmly advocated by Dathe, who endeav-

vored to prove that the Chaldee had copied or adapted the Syrian, there being passages in the Targum which could, he assumed, only be accounted for by a misunderstanding of the Syriac translation.\*

It is indeed almost certain, that the Targums, in their written form, are, perhaps without exception, more recent than the Syriac version. Still, they are probably the successors of earlier Targums which have by amplification reached their present shape. "Thus if existing Targums are more recent than the Syriac, it may happen that their coincidences arise from the use of a common source—an earlier Targum. †

But then, again, there is a striking agreement in many places between the *P'shito* and the LXX. This may be due in part to the original translators. The Greek version, which was begun about 280 B. C. and completed about 200 B. C., was early and extensively used. The New Testament writers most frequently cite the Old Testament according to the LXX. rendering. Even the Jews, before their controversies with the Christians, held that translation in high regard. What, therefore, could be more probable than that it influenced, to some extent at least, the Syriac translators who, in difficult passages, would naturally consult the renderings of a version so widely and greatly esteemed?

But it cannot well be supposed that all the coincidences, or even the greater part of them, are to be accounted for in this way. As regards agreement with the LXX., the MSS. of the *P'shito* show broad differences. This at once awakens the suspicion that the text has been tampered with by various hands; and when we remember the superstitious regard in which the LXX. was held, so that many of the Church fathers before Jerome viewed it as inspired and canonically authoritative, we can easily believe that numerous readings were introduced from it into the Syriac text.

\* Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 3421, where some of the curious resemblances between the two versions are given.

† Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 3387.

Unfortunately we have as yet no critical edition of the *P'shito*. The first printed edition of this version appeared in the Paris Polyglott in 1645; but the editor, Gabriel Sionita, had, it is said, only one, and that an imperfect, MS., and he is charged, perhaps unjustly, with having supplied large gaps, even to the extent of whole books, by translating from the Vulgate into the Syriac. This text was reprinted in Walton's Polyglott, 1657; but with no other change, it would seem, than the addition of some of the Apocryphal books. These, as forming no part of the original *P'shito*, were omitted from the last edition of the whole Old Testament, put forth, at the suggestion of the British and Foreign Bible Society, by Prof. Lee in 1823. Lee's text rests on a more solid foundation than the earlier text of the Polyglots. In preparing it he collated six Syriac MSS. of the entire Old Testament, and one very ancient MS. of the Pentateuch, and also consulted the commentaries of Ephraem Syrus and Bar Hebraeus. Still, his edition, however excellent in its day, has many defects; and it must be confessed that the printed text of the *P'shito* is far from satisfactory. It has even been questioned, whether the Syriac Old Testament, as it has come down to us, is substantially that used by Ephraem Syrus in the latter half of the 4th century. Wellhausen \* conjectures that the *P'shito* rests on an older Syriac version which comes to view in the citations of Aphraates and Ephraem, and which the later version has revised for the purpose of making it conform more closely to the Hebrew text. But to this Nöldeke † objects, that the citations by Ephraem have no such special affinity with the often very inaccurate citations from memory by Aphraates, that the text of both may be set as a unity over against the text of the *P'shito* as it has reached us. Moreover, a revision of the Syriac Bible according to the Hebrew after the time of Ephraem is altogether irreconcilable, since a knowledge of the Hebrew among the Syrians was lost after the sundering of the

\* In his edition of Bleek's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1878, p. 602.

† *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 1878, p. 589.

Edessene Church from Judaism. Even Jacob of Edessa, a man of scientific culture like Jerome, had picked up only a few crumbs of Hebrew, and yet gained a great reputation for Hebrew learning. And, besides, how could we explain the fact that the Syrians, civilly and confessionally divided as they were,—some the subjects of Rome, others of Persia, some of them Catholics, others Monophysites, and still others Nestorians,—should all have the same Bible, if this was the result of so late a revision? It certainly admits of no rational doubt that our *P'shito* is substantially the *P'shito* of Ephraem.

Its excellence as a translation is universally acknowledged. It is faithful to the original, the sense of which it carefully reproduces, without being either slavishly literal, like Aquila's version, or, like the Targums, paraphrastically free. It makes few additions or alterations, and these occur, for the most part, in particular books, as in the books of Chronicles, and occasionally in the books of Kings—an additional proof of a plurality of translators.

The text from which it was made was, *in the main*, our present Massoretic text. It was by no means exactly, but it was substantially the same. However, owing to our lack of a critically established Syriac text, it is impossible now to say how broad a difference really existed. Could we eliminate all that was introduced into the *P'shito* from the LXX. and other sources by the hands of later revisers, we should probably find that the consonantal text from which it was translated, varied comparatively little from that which lies before us in our Hebrew Bibles. Some of the points of difference now found we propose to illustrate by a few examples.\*

It must be remembered that at the time this version was made, the Hebrew text had as yet no vowel-signs, diacritic points or accents. It had probably not even a fixed division of verses definitely marked. At all events, in the Syriac as in the Greek version, the division of verses often differs from the Massoretic division, at times materially affecting the sense.

\* See Carpov, *Critica Sacra*, P. II., Cap. V., *De versione Syriaca Vet. Test.*

There were certainly, however, no vowel-points, as a few instances will make clear. In Gen. xlix. 24, we read: "From thence (אֶלְעָד) is the Shepherd, the Stone of Israel," but the Syriac read אֶלְעָד, and translates: "From the hands of the Mighty One of Jacob, and from the name of the Shepherd, the Stone of Israel."

Num. xxiv. 8: "God brought him forth out of Egypt; he hath as it were the strength of an unicorn (רֵאשִׁים נַחֲזִים); he shall eat up the nations, his enemies, and shall break their bones, and pierce them through with his arrows" (וְיִתְּבַּשֵּׂל). Perhaps in the MS. employed by the Syriac translator, the word רֵאשִׁים, rendered *unicorn* in the authorized version, was written defec-tively רֵאשׁ, as in Ps. xxii. 22 (ver. 21 in Eng.), which he read as if it were רֵאשׁ, *elevation*; for, either finding שׁ instead of שׁ in נַחֲזִים, or confounding the one with the other, he translates: "God brought them out of Egypt in his strength and his elevation;" and in the last clause, reading וְיִתְּבַּשֵּׂל instead of וְיִתְּבַּשְׁלֵל, he translates: "He shall cut their backs into pieces" (*hatsaihun n'phaseq*).

In Isa. xlix. 17, we have the word תְּבִיבָה. This may be pointed in two ways: תְּבִיבָה, *thy builders*, or תְּבִיבָה, *thy sons*; and just how it should be read, is a question asked in the Talmud. The latter is the Massoretic reading, and with this the Syriac agrees; but the former is the reading of all the other ancient versions.

Sometimes, owing to the lack of vowel-points, the Syriac reduces the consonants to a root different from that of the Massoretic text. For example, in Gen. xlix. 24, it is said of Joseph: "but his bow abode (בָּשָׁבֵן) in strength." There, however, the Syriac read בָּשָׁבֵן from בָּשָׁבֵן, *to return*, and accordingly translates: "His bow returned in strength."

And so Ex. xxxii. 5: "And Aaron saw" (רָאָה from רָאַה, *to see*); but the Syriac, reading רָאָה, translates: "And Aaron feared." A like instance is found in Gen. iii. 10, where the Hebrew has: "I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid (בָּאָמַרְתִּי), because I was naked;" but the Syriac stands:

"I heard thy voice in the garden, and I saw (**וְיָמִין**) that I was naked."

Some of the differences between the Hebrew and the Syriac are attributable to the absence of diacritic points. In Gen. xxvi. 38, Isaac is said to have named a certain well *Shebah* (**שְׁבַבָּה**, which may mean either *seven*, or, as the LXX. translates, *δόξος, oath*); which the Syriac read **רַבָּת**, and accordingly renders *fulness, abundance*, as does also the Vulgate: *appellavit eum Abundantiam.*

Sometimes the Syriac confounds similar letters, and so gets different meanings. It must be borne in mind how nearly alike certain Hebrew letters are, as **ב** and **בּ**, or **ל** and **לּ**, and how easily the one may be mistaken for the other. In Gen. xiv. 1 the Hebrew reads: "Tidel **בְּלִי** king of nations"; but instead of *Tidel*, the Syriac, confusing **ל** and **לּ**, and setting other vowels, has *Taril*; and instead of *King of nations* (**מלך**), it has *malko d'geleye, king of the Gelæ or Gelanilæ*,\* which it gets in all likelihood by reading **מֶלֶךְ** through mistaking **ל** for **לּ**.

Take another instance, in which the meaning is altogether changed by the alteration of a **ל** into a **לּ**. It is that difficult place, Is. viii. 20, which the English version renders: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light (**לֹא**) in them." Whatever may be the correct rendering of the Hebrew, the difficulties of this passage are not removed by reading with the Syriac and LXX. **לֹא** *gift* instead of **לֹא** *dawn*.

In many places, however, the Syriac translators had a consonant text differing from our Massoretic text. Thus Num. x. 33: "And they departed from the Mount of the Lord a journey of *three days*"; and so read all the ancient versions except the Syriac, which has "*a journey of one day.*"

Num. iii. 4: "And Eleazar and Ithamar ministered in the priest's office in the sight of Aaron their father"; but the Syriac differing from the Hebrew and all the other ancient versions reads: "And there served as priests Eleazar and Ithamar, the

\* See Payne Smith's *Thesaurus Syriacus*, sub voce, p. 729.

sons of Aaron their father"; so that the MS. of the Syriac translator must have read 'בְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן אֶת־בָּנָיו' instead of 'בְּנֵי אֶת־אַהֲרֹן בָּנָיו'.

Deut. xxi. 23: "For he that is hanged is accursed of God"; but the Syriac, here again alone, reads: "because he who blasphemeth God shall be hung."

Sometimes the sense is directly the opposite of the Hebrew. So, for example, in Gen. xli. 54, where the Hebrew has: "but in all the land of Egypt there was bread," whereas the Syriac reads: "there was no bread." And so again in Gen. xlii. 15, where Joseph swears: "by the life of Pharaoh," the Syriac has: "not by the life of Pharaoh."

At other times the person of a verb is so changed as to affect the sense to some extent; as, for example, Ex. xx. 24: "in all places where I record (**נִזְמֵן**) my name"; whereas the Syriac reads: "in all places where thou shalt cause my name to be remembered" (**נִזְמֵן**),—a reading that is regarded by some critics as preferable to the Massoretic.

Occasionally there are found omissions of single words or clauses. Carpzov cites as instances Gen. i. 30: "and to every beast of the earth," and Gen. xxxvi. 13: "these were the sons of Bashemath, Esau's wife"; but in both cases Lee's text contains these words.

Ps. x. 9 is, however, much abbreviated. In the Authorized Version it reads: "He lieth in wait secretly as a lion in his den: he lieth in wait to catch the poor; he doth catch the poor when he draweth him into his net." But the Syriac, beginning v. 9, with the last clause of v. 8, reads: "His eyes are set for the poor; and he lieth in wait to catch the poor in the drawing of his net."

So in other places there are additions. Gen. xii. 3: "And in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed," to which the Syriac adds: "and in thy seed." In Gen. xxxv. 29, to the words: "and his sons Esau and Jacob buried him," the Syriac adds: "in the sepulchre which his father Abraham had bought." At the end of Lev. x. 18, the Syriac adds: "that Aaron and his sons might eat it." 2 Chron. vi. 14 reads in the

Hebrew: "O Lord God of Israel, there is no God like Thee in heaven, nor in the earth." This the Syriac paraphrases, rather than translates: "there is none like Thee: Thou art a Lord who sittest in the heavens above, and Thy will is done in the earth beneath."

The deviations of the *P'shito* version from the Hebrew original render it of great value for the criticism of the Old Testament text. Its value in this regard would be still greater, if we could always be sure that we have before us the version in the form in which it came from the hands of the Syriac translators. But as it is, there can be no doubt that it has many good readings, which are worthy, to say the least, of serious consideration. We have only space for a few instances. In Is. lviii. 10, we read *תְּבִיא עֲמָקָם פֶּרַח*, the literal rendering of which is: "and bring forth (*פֶּרַח*, furnish, supply) thy soul to the hungry one"; which Nägelsbach\* understands to mean: "and draw forth (out of thy provision) to the hungry one that after which thy soul craves." The phrase is certainly, as Lowth says in his Commentary, obscure and without example in any other place. But instead of *תְּבִיא thy soul*, eight MSS., three of which are ancient, read *תְּבִיא בְּרֵא, thy bread*. And this is the reading of the Syriac, and it would seem also of the LXX., which expresses both words: *τὸν ἀρτὸν σου ἐξ φυγῆς σου, thy bread from thy soul.*

Gen. iv. 8, we read: *וְאָמַר קָרְבָּן אֶל-חَבֵל*, 'And Cain said to Abel his brother: and it came to pass when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel, his brother, and slew him.' What was said is not given, and has evidently fallen out of the text. The English version escapes the difficulty by the very doubtful rendering: "And Cain talked with Abel his brother." The lacking words, however, are supplied by the Syriac version, which is supported by the LXX., the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan v. Jerushalmi, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Vulgate, the Greek version of Aquila, and by the passage as cited by Philo, all of which read: "And Cain said to Abel his brother, Let us go out into the field. And it came to pass when

\* Lange's *Commentary on Isaiah, ad loc.*

they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him."

In 2 Sam. xv. 7 we read: "It came to pass after forty years." This number is a manifest error, though found in the LXX. and the other Greek versions, in the Chaldee and the printed text of the Vulgate. For since David reigned only forty years, the rebellion of Absalom, if the Hebrew text were correct, took place after the death of David. But the difficulty is removed by adopting the reading of the Syriac, which has *four* (פָּרַע) instead of *forty* (בָּאֵת). This reading is confirmed by the Arabic version, by the Sixtine edition of the Vulgate, by several MSS. of the same version, by Josephus and by Theodoret.

In Jud. vii. 18, we read: "When I blow with a trumpet, I and all that are with me, then blow ye the trumpets also on every side of the camp, and say, Of the Lord and of Gideon." The expression, "Of the Lord and of Gideon," seems to lack something, which the English translation has supplied from v. 20, by prefixing the words, "The sword." In this they were doubtless right, for the addition is found in the Syriac version and the Chaldee paraphrase.

In Psalm xxviii. 8, we read: יְהֹוָה יְשִׁיבָתָם, "Jehovah is their strength." But the pronoun has no antecedent; and it has been proposed, therefore to read: יְשִׁיבָתָךְ to his people instead of יְשִׁיבָתָם, to them. This is actually the reading in six MSS. and in the Syriac and other ancient versions.

One more instance taken from Gen. xlvi. 31. When Joseph has sworn to his father after the Hebrew manner, that he will not bury him in Egypt, then, it is said, "Israel bowed himself upon the head of the bed," (נִזְבַּח). But the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews had a different reading of this passage; for he says: "By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph, and worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff," (נִזְבַּח). This is the reading of the Syriac version and of the LXX.; and its correctness is confirmed by what has come to be known of the manner of taking an ordinary oath

among the ancient Egyptians. "Both the expression, 'by the life of Pharaoh,' and the custom of bowing upon the staff of an officer are traced by M. Charas in his interesting Essays on Egyptian judicial proceedings, where he cites the following passage describing the taking of an oath by a witness in a trial at Thebes: 'He made a life of the royal lord, striking his nose and his ears, and placing himself on the head of the staff,'—(*Mélanges Egyptologiques*, iii. I. 80), the ordinary oath when the witness bowed himself on the magistrate's staff of office. He well remarks that this explains the passage in Genesis quoted above, as a recognition by Jacob of his son's authority, (*ibid.* 91, 92). This illustration shows that the Septuagint is right in reading staff, (שָׁמֶן), in agreement with Hebrews xi. 21, where the Masoretes read *bed*, בֵּדְךָ; and a question of controversy disappears.\*

It was our purpose to speak of the value of the *P'shito* version for the interpretation of the Old Testament. The Syriac translation is even more important to the exegete than to the critic, as might readily be inferred from the affinity of its language with the Hebrew. This, however, is a subject too large for the little space now at our command. But we assure our younger ministers and theological students, that in the use of this version, they will be amply repaid for the little time and trouble necessary to master its language,—that language into which the New Testament was first translated, and which is almost identical with that spoken by our Lord and His disciples.

\* *Contemporary Review*, March, 1879, p. 753.

## ART. VII.—GOD, NATURE, AND MAN.

BY REV. THEODORE APPEL, D. D.

THERE are three great lights in the firmament of human existence, which rule the days and years of its history and progress. They are God, the greatest of all, the Father of lights, and then Nature and Man, the proper reflectors of His presence and glory. These are the primary teachers and educators of humanity, in its various stages up to the highest degree of culture, constantly challenging attention and confronting all alike with a benign and serene light. To intelligent beings like men they give to existence a disciplinary character, and organize it into a grand school, or rather into three departments of one great school, in which all alike in the nature of things are called to be disciples. When these primary ideas are properly appreciated, they become the fruitful sources of wisdom, knowledge and truth, creating a region of all-embracing light, where the air is ever transparent and the purest fountains never cease to flow. But when, on the other hand, they are misapprehended, they become the prolific occasions of multitudinous errors of the most dangerous kind, that cast their dark shadows over long centuries. Everything depends on our capacity to apprehend these stupendous themes, and then to be apprehended by them to the full extent of their power. Here, as well as elsewhere, we must have eyes to see, ears to hear, and a sense to perceive and apprehend. To him who is blind and deaf, or palsied, the external world of nature gives no intelligence, and for most purposes has no existence. And so it is with regard to other and higher worlds.

So far as experience goes, it is plain that these central ideas

of human thought have as yet only to a limited extent produced their proper educational effect in training men for their high destiny. Let us see how the matter stands. How is it with the idea of God, the purest and grandest of all? It has for the most part been obstructed, perverted or adulterated, as history everywhere teaches. Men did not like to retain the knowledge of God in their minds, and so they gave it up and substituted something else in His place. In quite modern times the attempt was made in France to dethrone Him in a legislative assembly by a majority of votes. The same thing is sometimes attempted by a course of philosophical reasoning. This is an advance on the old heathen system of idolatry, in which only a part of the divine glory is proposed to be given to dumb idols, whilst in naked and undisguised atheism everything is sacrificed. It is, however, only the legitimate result of all previous efforts from the earliest dawn of history to eliminate the Divine Being from the thoughts and feelings of men. They invariably proceed from the principle of negation—*von dem Geist der stets verneint*—from the spirit that always denies, which starting out in the way of an apparently honest criticism, seeks in the end to undermine the throne of the divine glory, and then to destroy it by a process of disintegration. The same result at other times is reached from the opposite direction. Sometimes men, instead of being repelled by the thought of God, have seemingly been captivated by it, and sought with the most strenuous efforts to magnify it, although always at the expense of all other ideas. They become apparently enslaved by it. The pantheist makes God to be everything, the great soul of the universe, and so all embracing as to leave no separate universe remaining for our contemplation. The Deity thus becomes a profound gulf, a veritable maelstrom, which draws in and absorbs all other existences. Spinoza, the prince of modern pantheists, has not inappropriately been called the god-intoxicated man.

With nature for the most part it has been otherwise. It is fair, beautiful and undeniably useful; hence it has not been

treated so ruthlessly as its Author and Lord. Here the spirit that denies has not been so actively at work as its twin-sister, the spirit that exaggerates and falsely glorifies. It becomes unduly magnified, and in fact deified as a result of that negative process, which rules God out of the universe. Men are constitutionally religious, and in proportion as they come to believe that there is no God, they naturally fall to worshiping His creatures, or representatives in nature, the sun, moon and stars, or other less dignified objects. They know nothing of God save what is left for them in His works. In our day this tendency shows itself in the gross materialism of the age as it discloses itself in unbelieving science. God is becoming again an unknown God to many, and the world beyond the region of matter appears as a dark and dreary void, no longer peopled with intellectual beings like ourselves, with no fields dressed in living green nor rivers of delight. Thus turned away from what was once supposed to be an eternal home, men naturally seek for objects of admiration and adoration, in what seems to them to be something less shadowy, in this tangible world of physical light and sunshine. In some of our poetry the love for nature goes beyond all that is legitimate and right, and borders on divine homage, generally as a result of a disrelish for what is higher and better in the spiritual world. Thus Byron lacked in reverence for both God and man, and at times Cain-like waged war against both. He, however, sees nothing but what is beautiful in nature, extols it in inimitable verse, and at times gives it a homage that borders on fetishism itself. He is the intoxicated devotee of his own marvellous creations.

But whilst nature has thus been unduly exalted and idolized, it has not on the other hand escaped the touch of a negative criticism that has sought to mar its fair visage. Sometimes it is regarded as merely phenomenal, which means that it is made up only of passing appearances, as if it had no substance or reality back of its phenomena. Bishop Berkley, apparently apprehensive that the science of nature, which was making such vast strides in his day, under the impulse given to it by Newton,

might do harm to religion, denied the actual existence of the external world. St. Augustine, under the influence of Platonism, thought that nature had only a quasi-existence. Many of the ancient philosophers went much further, and treated their foster mother much worse, by making matter the source of all evil. The Manicheans, the gymnosophists of India and other fanatical sects, therefore, hated it as something absolutely diabolical, from whose foul breath they must extricate themselves as much as possible, in order to arrive at a state of true holiness. The same way of thinking entered the Christian Church, as Isaac Taylor has shown in his learned work on Ancient Christianity, and to that extent interfered with the simplicity of the gospel. The Buddhist continues to be of this mind to the present day, and seeks heavenly rest in his Nirvana, an abstraction, if not a non-entity, by doing all he can to free himself from the supposed shackles of his natural life, the very condition in which he has been placed by his Maker, in order to attain to the highest end of his existence.

Those who regard nature as merely phenomenal, with no divine substratum underneath it, generally look down upon it with some sort of commiseration, as a helpless world of shadows and vanity, where they weep for it when they should weep for themselves, when happiness culminates. Sometimes they write sentimental poetry about its changing seasons, with its fading flowers and leaves, as if it were a mere passing shadow, without imagining that it is a spoken word of God, by which they are fed and clothed, and benefited in ten thousand other ways. But pure idealists, especially of the German school, at times do not fail to disclose their true animus, and but illy disguise their contempt and disgust for its grand, and most beautiful appearances. Hegel, as if our glorious cosmos were in the way of his flight into the region of barren abstractions, contemptuously calls the stars the fever spots of the sky, *die Fieber Flecken des Himmels*. It is wonderful how very intellectual men can be enamored by their own little gardens in which they have spent their days, and then imagine that all the world on the outside is a wilderness.

Man, the third object of our contemplation, can hardly be said to have fared any better in the development of thought than his Maker or his pleasant home in the bosom of nature. The throne of the universe must be filled somehow in order to satisfy men's thoughts of fitness and propriety. Hence when it is supposed to be vacant in consequence of the elimination of its rightful owner, and nature cannot be brought to fill the place, then the only available candidate left is to be found in humanity. Reason must be embodied somewhere, and the inference is that it can be nowhere else except in the personality of man. Thus he gains the ascendancy, becomes the highest form of deity, and must needs be invested with divine honors. Whatever reason may be found in the works of creation, or in the idea of a Supreme Being, is impersonal and unconscious, and it can complete itself only in humanity, it is thought, where will and thought are known to exist. Fortunately few individuals have ever had the presumption to claim for themselves the honor due to the gods. The Roman Emperors and some of the heroes of antiquity, like Alexander the Great, sought the title and exacted the homage, but they did it from political considerations, more than from any very sincere convictions. In our days, some sentimental writers of a transcendental turn of mind, after apparently much searching throughout the universe for a god, flatter themselves that they have found one in overpowering splendor in humanity, which with no small degree of exultation they are willing to serve as well as adore.

The devotee of nature, intoxicated with its grandeur objects very properly to such an absurdity; but then he is just as one-sided. He seeks to disparage man, to drag him down from such an imposed height, and to reduce him to the most attenuated link in the immensity of being. He regards him as a part, but after all a very insignificant part in this vast creation of ours. He speaks in glowing language of the immensity of the universe; he piles up worlds upon worlds, systems upon systems without limit, in this infinitude of space, and then triumphantly asks the question, What is man in this vast array of worlds?

With an affectation savoring of humility, and adopting the language of Scripture, he answers the question by comparing him to a grain of sand on the shore of the ocean, or to a mere mote that dances for a moment in the sun-beam, and then dies forever. If he is not absolutely nothing, with all his hopes and aspirations, he is nevertheless a mere infinitesimal, or next to nothing. Thus man hurls his anathema first at his Maker, then at the world in which he lives, and lastly, at himself, and all others like himself. Could we have a better proof of his abnormal state?

Thus it will appear that there is no small amount of strife and discord among scientists, philosophers, and theologians in the different departments of thought, in which alone, however, man must seek for wisdom, training and true strength. Variance and confusion prevail, where there ought to be no difference of opinion. The very spectacle of such a clashing of interests would sometimes lead us to suppose that in building up the mighty structure of Christian civilization, we were in danger, at times, of being smitten with a confusion of tongues in the intellectual world. The tendency of such a state of things is inevitably towards disintegration, dissolution and death.

But is there no remedy for this disorder, confusion and strife? Two evil spirits, as we have seen, the spirit of negation, and that of exaggeration, let loose from the bottomless pit, have gone forth to deceive the nations. They meet with only too ready a response in the minds of men, who are prone to contradict on the one hand, or, on the other, to give free scope to their imagination. It is a matter of encouragement and hope, however, to know that there is no contradiction in the nature of things themselves. The conflict is between the ideas which men form of the objects of their contemplation. The difficulty lies in ourselves, in our organs, as well as in our surroundings, which prevent us from seeing the light that was intended to be our guide. We must, therefore, seek to get out of the darkness, and gain a position somewhere above the mists,

from which we may survey the situation of affairs from horizon to horizon.

History teaches us unmistakably the lesson that unsighted reason is not capable of solving the questions that refer to God, eternity, immortality and human destiny, in which we all as individuals have the most profound interest. Not to speak in detail of the failure of those magnificent systems of philosophy in this direction in modern times, by far transcending in their effects the great financial failures in money-centres, we merely turn to the ancient philosophies as illustrations of the utter helplessness of human speculation in answering the questions referred to in a satisfactory way. The period of Grecian philosophy inaugurated by Socrates, and carried forward by Plato, Aristotle and Zeno, was a brilliant page in history. They inspired hope, trust and confidence for a while, gilding the horizon with the auroral beams of what promised to be a bright and illustrious morn. But the promised day settled down in the gloom of a dreary night of doubt and uncertainty. The watchman on the mountain-top spake only of night; he could never announce the approach of day. At the beginning of the Christian era, the civilized world generally had fallen into the embrace of scepticism, doubt and despair. Cæsar denied the future state, and Cicero doubted even when he wrote in its favor. Christianity entered the arena of history in the midst of this universal uncertainty among men. It announced the divine revelation as made in their day, which answered satisfactorily all those difficult questions over which philosophers had wrangled like fierce warriors, or chattered like so many magpies. It was listened to with intense interest; and, in a comparatively short period of time, it made conquests of the hearts and consciences of men. The light of the schools paled in the presence of the new-born heavenly light. The victory, however, was not won by philosophical arguments or profound speculations. The first preachers of the gospel did not attempt to prove or demonstrate anything like philosophers: they preached, that is, they acted the part of heralds, and simply proclaimed the truth, with

no parade of learning, defending themselves and their cause with popular common sense persuasion. The truth nevertheless won its way through storms of opposition and persecution by its own intrinsic power. Certainty took the place of probability, hope the place of despair, and faith the place of doubt and scepticism. It was faith that accomplished the miracle, overcame the world, and laid the foundation of the new era of history in which we now live.

Such illustrations as these are instructive, and throw much light on the subject we are here discussing. They might be indefinitely prolonged. They point out to us the star of faith and Christian hope, as our only infallible guide, when our infinite minds come to grasp the truths of the infinite. Reason has failed to do justice, alike to nature, humanity and divinity. It has often proved to be a stubborn and intractable obstacle in the way of true knowledge, creating darkness in the place of light, or, as sometimes, nonsense in the place of sense. But whenever it has proved recreant to its high and holy calling, it has been so simply because it has not been *mixed with faith*, ignoring the true light from above, which alone is capable of guiding the mariner out in the dark sea of life. In view then of such unhappy experience, we must give up the old way of conducting our inquiries, overgrown with briers, and walk in the new and living way inaugurated by Christianity, which, however, is not absolutely new, but the actual supplement and fulfillment of the old. If men are disposed to reason, and nothing can or should prevent them from exercising this noblest of all gifts, it will simply not do for them to take up their abodes on hillocks in the dark valley below; they must ascend the heights above them, some Andean height nearer heaven and God, and there establish their observatories and make their observations. Christian faith here is not only a friendly light, but a necessity in the midst of surrounding errors and falsehoods, that shut out the true light from above.

The word faith, however, in which men find rest and peace when every other refuge has failed them, has to many minds,

disagreeable associations connected with it. Owing to the connections in which it has been made to stand in its conflicts in the past, it is often suggestive of a dark and narrow superstition, as if it were the enemy of knowledge and science, closely allied to ignorance and fanaticism, a power regulated by no law, void of charity, and something if not closely watched, that may do great harm to the interests of society. Frequently it is considered as a species of blind credulity, wedded to a creed handed down by tradition, without evidence and without any conviction of the truth it embraces, which as something blind may serve the interests of evil as readily as of that which is good. But this is not faith ; it is just its opposite, as remote from it as the heavens from the earth ; it is a mere covering of barnacles that have fastened themselves to the noble ship of Christianity. Faith has to do with the highest truths that concern man ; it moves in the element of light and truth ; it has God and a supernatural revelation for its objects. To be capable at all of communing with such themes, it must assume the highest form of reason, for it brings men's minds in contact with the original sources of truth. It goes far beyond a mere assent of the understanding ; it carries with it in a still greater degree the consent of the heart, which discerns, discriminates, and judges fully as much as the intellect or understanding. The head and the heart have the most intimate relations in our physical organization, and it is difficult to say which is the most central or vital. The brain moves the heart whilst the heart supports the brain. So it is in the spiritual man within us. Here head and heart unite their energies in grasping the unseen world, and the result is faith, which though it sees many things as yet darkly, nevertheless, perceives the light of truth, and so saves the soul from sinking downward into the region of despair. Sometimes it is said that man is the head, whilst woman is the heart of humanity, in which there is doubtless much truth. Accordingly, as the two are supplementary and mutually support each other in earthly things, so in heavenly things, it is by means of the reciprocal help which they give to each other in

grasping after the infinite, that they succeed in gaining a truthful intuition of the higher world of truth and reality. It is doubtful whether man without woman, or woman without man, would retain permanently the revelation of divine truth as made in Christianity. Its history, especially during the darker period of the middle ages, teaches clearly enough that woman has fully done her part in the spread of Christian civilization.

Let us now see from the standpoint of Christian faith, how we may orient ourselves and see daylight over all these wide regions, where clouds and darkness seem to so large a portion of mankind to be still resting. As already said, it is the ideas of God, man and nature, in men's minds that are in conflict, and not the objects which they represent. The difficulty, which hitherto has seemed insurmountable, is to hold them in their proper relation to each other.

The two most celebrated definitions of God on the side of philosophy proceeded from Aristotle in ancient times and from Newton in our days. The former presents Him in the light of a dark, mysterious intelligence or power, leaving us in doubt whether he regarded Him as a personal being or not; the latter, as might be expected, towers far above the stagirite, when he comes to speak of the great Governor and Lord of all things, in his celebrated general scholium at the end of his work on the universe, the Principia. Although a devout believer in divine revelation himself, in a book on nature he necessarily describes the Deity merely as the God of nature, and by so doing could present to us in his grand description of the Deity after all only a faint reflection of the divine glory as seen in His more external attributes. But it is quite otherwise when we get out of the halls of philosophy and sit at the feet of Christ for instruction. The simple, popular language of Scripture furnishes us with representations of God, which to men generally, of all lands and ages, are more intelligible, more truthful, and at the same time more profound and comprehensive than tomes of definitions and distinctions piled up by the labors of the learned; and we may add, more demonstrative than the

argument in support of the divine being and His attributes, so often attempted by philosophers. A few descriptions of God and His relation to the world, selected almost at random, from scripture will suffice. Thus, He is the Creator, the Preserver and Up-holder of all things; He is the King, immortal and invisible, the only wise God; the supreme Lawgiver, the Source of all authority in heaven and upon earth, who rules the winds and waves, counts the hairs of our heads and notices the fall of a sparrow; He is the inexorable Judge, who holds the balance in His hands and upholds everywhere without swerving the interests of righteousness and truth; the Father of lights, in whom there is no variableness nor shadow of turning; and then in His Son the full revelation of Himself, He becomes our heavenly Father, our Saviour, our Lord and Redeemer, and though the Avenger of all wrong and injustice, He is said to be Love itself. He thus reveals Himself as infinitely above us, and yet as dwelling among us as a personal being, calling us His children and recognizing the image and likeness which He in the beginning impressed upon us. Such popular conceptions of the deity, all culminating in the Word made flesh, will never, we may believe, be erased from the tablet of human-consciousness. They shed too much light upon a dark and mysterious realm; they settle too well all other difficult questions; they set aside all false conceptions of God, pantheism, atheism, materialism, nihilism, and, in a word, a host of errors, which, like swarms of locusts, obstruct the light of the central luminary of the universe.

With this exaltation of the idea of God, the true idea of nature becomes at once simple and intelligible to us. It is not God on the one hand nor the dwelling-place of Satan on the other. It is nevertheless the workmanship of the Divine Architect; it is His footstool, it was produced by the divine word in the beginning, and it is still upheld by the same. Whilst it presents the most diversified phenomena, it is not exclusively phenomenal. Continually changing in its aspects, it has beneath its external appearances something which does not change. It has two sides, the outward phenomena and the

internal forces which are continually producing the outward manifestations. So it is taken as whole, and so it is in all its parts. The laws constitute its essential and vital part—its very substance, without which there could be no nature, just as the outward form of a plant or animal is not the plant or the animal without the life that holds it together and makes it what it is. At the same time, however, they are related to God as expressions of His sovereign will, localized in time and space, utterances of the divine reason, words of His mouth, full of wisdom and truth, which could not exist as mere sounds or inoperative commands, but must become and exist as real things. Nature thus has a spiritual side and a permanent value, something vastly more than mere inert stuff, as matter is sometimes denominated. The old philosophers, therefore, erred egregiously when they imagined they saw in it the spirit of all evil, and dreaded its recesses as the abode of evil spirits. The laws of which we here speak, invisible, inaccessible to our outward senses, ever active beneath the surface of things, are full of reason and always open to our intelligence; and he who reads them aright is reading all the while the very thoughts of the Creator as He reveals them to us in the outward creation, which is one of the two books written by His own fingers, a vast volume with many pages and leaves. Most morbid then is that habit of mind which sees nothing here that is divine, ennobling or wholesome as an element in the education and training of man. True to its mission, nature gives us physical sustenance, but it does much more for us in developing our understandings by presenting itself to us as an intellectual system underlying its outward manifestations. Nor should we overlook the fact that it has an aesthetic side, a system of sublime symbolism, which like the spires of temples of worship, points up without intermission to heaven and God. As a whole, as well as in its parts, it is a parable, speaking to us of spiritual and heavenly things. It is according to its constitution a vast storehouse of images, and symbols, ready for our use in the illustration of supersensuous things, without which we could not speak of

them at all intelligently. Our first parents, in a state of innocence, saw this, and enlightened believers see it now. Poets have often shown that they have a perception of it also. The heathen, however, have lost sight of it and retain nothing but the empty shell or symbol, which has become a god to them. In like manner the false science of the day, which with the telescope penetrates the universe and sees nothing beyond but interminable darkness, sees nothing divine in the constitution of nature, and of course cannot comprehend its sublime meaning. Hence faith is just as much needed to enable men to comprehend the divine element that pervades creation as it is in reference to God Himself. By faith we know that the worlds were made, and it is by faith alone that we are enabled to perceive the divine radiance which is shed upon them from the shining world of light above and beyond. Without faith it is all an impenetrable gloom, from which neither philosophy nor science can extricate us.

Having placed the natural world around us in its proper light as the creature and servant of God, as a school full of light and wisdom for man, we are so much the better prepared to see and understand the position and relations of man in the cosmos. He is not God, nor part of God, nor of His substance, as philosophers gravely assert. We, as individuals, are all conscious of this, and it is by no means a humiliating confession, because we are conscious of many weaknesses and imperfections. It is manifestly a cruel kind of flattery, which no truthful man, and certainly no truthful woman, can endure, to be told that we are gods and goddesses, when our strength so often fails us under our burdens. But in our day, we apprehend that the danger of deifying man is not so great as that which comes from the opposition, inasmuch as the fashion of disparaging him is coming more and more into vogue. Here it is the naturalist, and not the philosopher, who seeks to do us harm and injustice. The argument is a popular one, and at first view, seems to be not without force. We have already referred to it, but we will here state it more fully, because when pro-

perly considered it will be seen not to disparage man, but rather to exalt him, as the greater light of nature.

Modern astronomy has within a comparatively short period of time made immense strides. It has opened up to our view the magnitude and grandeur of the universe to an extent never dreamed of by the wisest men in former ages. The fixed stars, for instance, which appear to us as mere points of light, are immense bodies, suns and centres of systems like our own, a million of times larger than this world of ours. Those visible to us through instruments are many millions in number, and many millions of millions of miles distant from us. The light of some of them required many hundreds and probably many thousands of years to reach us. The light of just as many more, it is believed by astronomers, has not yet arrived at our own planet. Far beyond the milky way, the system of stars to which we belong, there are many other galaxies or firmaments, as large and as numerously studded with stars and systems as our own, and yet so remote from us, that they shrink up into nebulous patches of light, mere cloudlets, invisible to the eye, and seen through a glass, no larger than the palm of a hand. Thus systems upon systems of worlds multiply and increase on us far out in the depths of space, where planets, inhabited by intelligent beings like ourselves, revolve around their centres, comets come and go, and meteors flash across the evening skies. To us the heavenly bodies are practically without any numerical limit. So vast and so grand is creation externally regarded, apart from the laws and forces, that govern and control them, which are vaster still. Now, if we ask the question what is man in this vast army of worlds, as already said, there seems to be only one answer; which is, that he is a mere point, the tiniest insect that basks in the sunshine of life's brief hour and then dies. As a matter of course, when he dies, that is the end of his existence. To suppose that the great Sovereign of the universe should concern Himself about so insignificant a creature, as to order the events of His Providence for his benefit, is a thought that cannot be entertained for a moment,

Much more incredible must it appear that He should send down His own Son to become incarnate for our redemption, and so prepare the way for the general resurrection of the good and just at some future last great day. But forcible as this course of reasoning may appear at the first glance, it falls to pieces as soon as we recover ourselves from our amazement at the wonders of the natural creation. It contains a notable fallacy; it does not distinguish between quantity and quality; and it confuses matter and mind. True, man occupies a small portion of space, but with his power of thought he can penetrate the most distant parts of the universe in the twinkling of an eye, and so in a sense fill it with his presence. He is a rational, self-conscious being, and destined to live when the outward universe shall pass away as of no further use, for he possesses within himself elements worthy of being gathered up out of the general conflagration and of being preserved in the palaces of eternity; and it is not at all absurd to suppose that God should interpose in a miraculous way to save him and raise him from the dead. Judged from this point of view, he rises upward in the ascending scale of being. He is of more value than many sparrows, more excellent than mountains of prey; yes, and of more account than the entire natural universe separately considered. A single man is in fact intrinsically worth more than a fixed star, a little child of more importance than a planet or a blazing constellation.

Under this view, man becomes in a subordinate sense an object of homage to himself, in which feeling there is no room for pride, envy or hatred, which are all eliminated by the higher feelings of honor, respect, veneration and love. It is only a narrow and contracted view of man as a whole, or of men as individuals, that makes it possible for them to tread each other down into the dust or devour each other like so many wild beasts. Animals still retain something of that homage for man, although in a blind way, which would have been universal among men, had he not fallen from his first estate. It is said that Luther's schoolmaster was accustomed to bow to his

scholars when he entered the school-house, and that he did so from principle. He justified himself on the ground that boys had in them that which entitled them to his respect. His motto was *magna reverentia pueris debetur*. This, however, as we take it, was never intended to be understood in a one-sided sense, so as to exclude the girls, who represent fully one-half of youthful humanity. With a small change we can adapt the aphorism so as to make it include them also without any doubt in the family of candidates, who in a few years will be called to rule the world. *Magna reverentia puellis debetur*. It is also true that great reverence is due to the girls.

Men may degrade themselves and descend to the very borders of the animal world, and yet they are men and carry within themselves the possibilities of an indefinite expansion and elevation. They are wrecks of noble vessels that lie stranded on the shores of the ocean of human existence. We visit the ruins of ancient cities, of palaces and temples, and with profound emotions, meditate on the glory and splendor that have passed away; but the wreck of a man is in fact, when we properly reflect on the matter, a profounder subject for meditation and thought than the ruins of Thebes or Palmyra. In these outward ruins there is no prospect of a restoration, and what once was can never be again. It is otherwise with moral wrecks and ruins; they involve the possibility of restoration and renewal, in which the second temple shall exceed the first in glory.

Humanity, as a whole, is still a light, although dimmed and paled as it has been by sin. But it has not been left to itself to go out in eternal darkness. The kingdom of heaven has been established on the earth, and now a redeemed humanity in the Christian Church is taking the place of that which was nigh unto death. As the body of Christ, its original image is restored, and in a far higher degree, it has become the mirror which reflects the brightness and glory of the divine presence over the darkness of the sin-stricken world. As a divine-human institution, the Church has been called the light of the

world by Christ Himself, who thus likens it to Himself as the luminary, in a secondary sense, from which the whole world is to be filled with light. In this renewed humanity the individual is not absorbed in the general effulgence of a grand galaxy, but each becomes a distinct, independent light, which shines brighter and brighter unto the perfect day. The righteous we are told shall shine as the stars of the firmament for ever and ever.

There is then a region of light here in this world, notwithstanding the mists, in which all may walk, grow and perfect themselves. It is the basis of all true culture, the life and spirit of all true education. It encompasses us as we sit down and as we rise up, and surrounds us from the cradle to the grave. It is the revelation of the great God through His Son, reflected from all His works and embodied in the progress of the world's history. Shall we walk in this light and be continually apprehended by it? The answer to this settles the question of the culture, progress and education of man. If he be a mere bauble out on the ocean of being, a mere animal that cannot pass beyond the limits of animal life, then it is a question of no great consequence whether attempts be made to elevate him or to permit him to remain in his wild and savage state; whether efforts be made to recall him from his wanderings in the forests to a life of refinement in the walks of civilization, or whether he had not better be left to himself? Most persons would say that in such circumstances, it would be best for him to enjoy his animal appetites to the extent of his capacity, rather than by educational influences to awaken in him aspirations for an imaginary state of bliss, which can never be realized. But if man is not an insect nor a god, but a being formed in the image of God, and susceptible of an indefinite progress, both here and hereafter, then it follows that he is a subject for culture, education and the highest degree of refinement. As a rude piece of marble just taken from the quarry he may be polished, and in the hands of a skilful artist be made to reflect permanently the light of the material world and the full glories of the heavenly state. But all here depends in our position with regard to the influences

which are brought to bear upon us from without in the educational process. The three factors mentioned as distinct lights are one and inseparable. No person truly can enjoy the light of the one without the others. There is an education, which is an advance downward and not upward, that leads, not to the sources of all truths, but perverts them; an education that has no reverence, no faith, no humility, and no respect for the primary teachers in the great school of which we have spoken, but ignores them, and prefers its own phosphorescent light. From the evil negative influence of such kinds of culture, let us all beware. The light that is in them is darkness. Self-interest, or self, is the centre of the whole process, not God, who is the centre of all centres and the centre of the universe. True education, starting in faith, seeks the light and walks in that light. It regards the human mind as a garden, which must not only be freed from noxious weeds, but be open to receive the light of the sun, the dew of the morning, and the rain of vernal showers which come from beyond it and stimulate its plants and flowers to a healthy and normal growth. The fear of the Lord, we are told, is the beginning of wisdom; and who, upon mature reflection, will doubt that it is also the beginning of all true education, yes, such a beginning, or vital principle, as should underlie the whole process, control all special training in schools and academies, and result in rich fruit as its end? We plead here in this Christian land for a Christian nurture and a Christian training; one that has a spiritual foundation and a spiritual destiny. That we believe is what all true parents wish to see in their children. When they return from school they are not so much concerned about the amount of knowledge they have acquired, as about their moral habits, the purity of their feelings and lives, their reverence and respect, and their adaptednesss to become useful members of society. He or she who pursues faithfully the course of instruction in an institution, who has formed for himself the noblest character, and approaches the highest Christian ideal, is the student who, among those who know him best, irrespective of the action of the faculty, takes, in fact, the highest honor.

We do not deem it necessary, on an occasion like the present, to defend female education, or even to urge its importance. It has become an old and a somewhat hackneyed subject. The exercises of the day and of this evening hour speak for themselves, and furnish the best argument for female culture in seminaries of learning. Woman has the same high destiny, and the same responsibility as man, and is entitled to the same advantages in perfecting herself for her mission in life. Only let her education be, as all education should be, Christian in the proper sense of the term. In such a land as ours, and in communities where female seminaries are usually located, it is difficult to conceive that it should be otherwise, although too often this element in the general training of the school is overlooked or not sufficiently emphasized. There is more danger, no doubt, of infidelity creeping into institutions for young men than for those intended for young ladies. But, if that is so, it is fortunate that we have female education as one of the best correctives of such a growing skeptical tendency; because, if unbelief manifests itself among young men or even old men, well-educated ladies will be best prepared to meet and resist it.

In conclusion permit us to say that it affords us great pleasure to be present, and to be permitted to enjoy the festivities of this day. A school like this, established on a true Christian basis, with a broad and liberal platform of instruction, with an experienced and competent head, and an able faculty, is an ornament to this place, to this part of the state, and to good old Westmoreland county. It deserves the sympathies and support of an intelligent and discriminating community, and we fervently wish and hope to see it prosper more and more each year, and long continue to be a power for good in our noble Keystone State. *Semper vivat et floreat Academia Greensburgensis.\**

\* This article embraces the substance of an address, here somewhat enlarged, which was delivered at the commencement of the Greensburg Female Seminary, at Greensburg, Pa., on the 22d of June last. This school, under the care of the Rev. Lucian Cort, A. M., is pursuing a highly useful career in promoting female education in the western part of this state.

**ART. VIII.—NEGATIVE PREPARATION FOR THE REFORMATION.**

BY REV. S. R. BRIDENBAUGH, A. M., BERLIN, PA. \*

To speak of a *preparation* for such an event as the Reformation of the sixteenth century implies at once a conception of it different from that very commonly entertained. For, whilst it is true that in recent times a decided advance has been made in the correctness of the views maintained of this great movement, yet, even now, it is not an unusual thing to hear it spoken of as an isolated event, sustaining no connection with the historic past. Many, even in this age, write and speak of the Protestant movement as altogether preternatural, one that burst upon the world suddenly, without a previous preparation reaching back through centuries. Some of them regard it as drawn directly from the Bible. Martin Luther discovered a Bible in the library of the University of Erfurth, and in this they find the whole cause of the Reformation, notwithstanding the fact that the Church had the Bible all through the Middle Ages.

Other theories and explanations have been given of the rise of Protestantism, which, to any thoughtful mind, we think, must appear no less unreasonable than that already suggested. Writers for instance, so opposite in their views and spirit as Bossuet and Voltaire, account for the whole movement by looking upon it as having its origin in a "squabble of the

\* In the preparation of this article I have consulted and derived aid from "Dr. Dorner's History of Protestant Theology," "Milman's History of Latin Christianity," "Ullmann's Reformers before the Reformation," and the Lectures on Mediæval Church History by Dr. Thos. G. Apple in the Seminary at Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

monks"—a quarrel that afforded an opportunity for a participation by all the seditious spirits of the age. Another class find the cause of the Reformation in the ambition of sovereigns—in their rivalry with the ecclesiastical authority—and hence call it merely a continuation, in a new phase, of the conflict which the popes had long been waging with the Hohenstaufen Emperors. And Guizot in his "General History of Civilization in Europe" expresses the judgment that it was a sudden effort to achieve for human reason freedom from the bonds of authority—"an insurrection of the human mind against the absolute power of the spiritual order." Nor are there wanting, on the one hand, Roman Catholics and, on the other hand, Rationalists themselves, who make the Reformation a transitional era, opening the way for untrammelled freedom of thought and disbelief.

There is a Protestant view of the Reformation no less one-sided and narrow than that generally entertained by the Romanist. That Protestant conception, for instance, is narrow which views this great movement as an isolated event, a new light "flashing, as it were, directly from the clouds," which fails to see and acknowledge what was natural, and, relatively at least, even necessary in the onward progress and historical development of Roman Catholicism during the Middle Ages. Such a view, disregarding the fact that it had its roots far back in the past, that it sprang from the ecclesiastical development of the Mediæval period, and was of slow, gradual growth, leaves the great epoch of the Reformation without any historical explanation.

Equally one-sided and narrow is that Roman Catholic conception which utterly ignores the historical necessity of the Reformation, undervalues the importance and deep, far-reaching significance of it for the Church of Christ, and for humanity, and which regards the Mediæval Church, in every particular, with the Papal hierarchy and its whole system of government as divinely constituted and of binding force for all time. According to this, the Reformation cannot possibly be justified,

and the whole of Protestantism is only a schism, a rebellion, an apostasy arrayed against the divinely instituted Church. But the faithful and impartial study of history enables one to see the error in both these views.

"The correct historical view," says Dr. Ullmann, "may be characterized by the following few traits: It openly and unreservedly owns, first, that Catholicism with its institutions was, under the existing conditions, developed with historical necessity, and that it has been as a whole, and principally for the Middle Ages, as it now is relatively for modern times, of great consequence and of undeniable aptitude: Secondly, that from the very outset of its development, much human imperfection, sin, and narrow-minded unchristianism, penetrated into it, and gradually waxed so powerful, and offered so great an obstruction to the cultivation of the better Christian elements, that an advance beyond it, by means of a return to what was primitive and pure, became likewise a necessity, and after long preparatory steps, at last actually ensued in the Reformation."

The Reformation then was a movement in the sphere of religion. True, it was not disconnected with phenomena other than religious, for every form of the world's life was stirred up. Many tendencies and influences, under the guiding hand of Providence, wrought toward the same great end, and many results followed, producing political and social changes among the nations of the earth. Yet it was primarily, and in its distinctive character an event within the domain of religion. As such, it was not merely something negative, a protesting and setting aside of errors and abuses, but an advance on what had preceded, a result of previous history, the issue of a mighty spiritual process reaching back through the centuries of the past. As in the world of nature, there can be no lasting organic production except from some vital germ which potentially includes the life actually developed from it, so does the same general law obtain in every religious phenomenon entitled to the name of Reformation. A *Re*-formation implies not the idea of a *creation* of something altogether new, but a *forming*

again of that which already exists. It rests, according to the author already quoted, upon an established foundation, and this becomes the basis of further development. In this process of development there will be conflict with that which is false and corrupt. For the reformation or renovation of an already existing institution implies that it has evils and corruptions which must be abolished.

In order for the Reformation of the sixteenth century to become an epoch in history, a point of transition from the mediæval to the modern period, there had to be great preparatory movements. Otherwise such a phenomenon in history could have been produced just as little as a giant oak could come forth "without deep and widespread roots, and a firm ground from which to grow."

We come to the Reformation on the one hand, through a legitimate development of the Roman Catholic Church, while, on the other hand, we can clearly discern the free movement of the Spirit of God, who brings to His struggling Church a deposit of new life, which carries with it the regeneration of the old. In a very deep sense, therefore, is Protestantism the natural, ripened product of the religious life and spirit of the middle ages, though different from it; just as mediæval Christianity was, in one view, the product and legitimate development of the Primitive Church, though different from it both in its outward form and inner life. Issuing thus from the bosom of mediæval Catholicism, it could come only after a preparation long and thorough. The causes and forces entering into this preparation for the Reformation centuries before its actual advent are found to be of a two-fold character, negative and positive.

The *negative* preparation lies, of course, in the errors and defects, the abuses and corruptions of the Roman Catholic Church, which gradually assumed such proportions as forced a reaction, culminating in the Reformation.

These glaring defects come clearly to view when we glance at the *polity* which, long before, had come to prevail in the Roman Church.

And in noting these failings and abuses we cannot be unmindful of the benefits of the papal system, of the great good and important services rendered to humanity by the Catholic Church of the middle ages. These should ever be borne in mind.

For centuries Latin Christianity reigned supreme over Western Europe. The Roman Catholic Church, though growing more and more corrupt from age to age, was still the Church of Christ. Through her, blessings were dispensed to humanity. She was the guardian of education. Within the sacred enclosures of the monastic schools the treasures of learning were preserved. Here were prepared the scholars of the age. Though confined to certain spheres, the results of education in various departments remain, to the present day, the admiration of the world. By the struggles of that period were laid the foundation of law, of social order, and of that civilization now blessing the nations of the earth. Our present modern era is under lasting obligations to it for what it accomplished, in those times of comparative darkness, in favor of political discipline, social order, education, literature, art, morals and religion.

A mighty problem confronted the Church at the dawn of the mediæval period. Vast hordes of barbarians came pouring from the north of Europe, and spread over the decaying empire of Rome. The Church undertakes the great work of civilizing and Christianizing these rude, uncultured tribes. Unprepared, as they were, to embrace the Gospel in its spirituality and freedom, it accommodates itself to them and assumes more and more a legal aspect. The Pope becomes the "great pedagogue," the Church, the "rigid school-mistress," in the training of these nations for Christ. In accordance with the needs of the age, that Providence, which rules the history of the world and the Church, had established in the depths of the past the foundations of that "awe-inspiring ecclesiastical authority" and that strong hierarchical organization by which these rude Western nations should be led to Christianity and prepared for freedom.

Relatively, therefore, this powerful hierarchy, culminating in the colossal phenomenon of the papacy, may be regarded as beneficial and even necessary. But the very work of the Church in this period gave it a constitution and tendency which led to an unnatural restraint upon the proper freedom and independence of the various nationalities, becoming in the end an intolerable tyranny. Under episcopal robes was hidden human nature, with its weaknesses and passions, its desire of honor and glory, and its natural inclination to abuse the power entrusted to it. Beholding the Romanic and Germanic nations with deep devotion submissive to the Romish chair, the already secularized hierarchy attempted to enforce upon them its idea of *Universal Christian Theocracy*.

This attempt brought on the fierce conflict between Church and State. These two, Church and State, were indissolubly united. Especially was this the case during the course of German history. Here the Empire and the Papacy are developed side by side. They act and react upon each other, now supporting and now opposing each other, until they reach the full blossom of their prosperity and begin to decline. Their reciprocal influence and struggle for the mastery constitute the very heart-throbs in the historical movements of the middle ages. The Papacy, for a time dependent on the Empire, is not satisfied when complete emancipation and independence of this power is attained. No mere co-ordination, no balance of powers, can satiate the ambitious spirit of a Gregory VII. With him one must predominate—one must rule, the other serve. Heretofore the hierarchy had been more or less subject to the secular power, and ecclesiastics were dependent upon their sovereign for investiture with the badges of their office. Now this relation must be entirely reversed. Henceforward the State must be subordinate to the Church. Being supernaturally endowed, the Church is to reign supreme over all other powers, and the Pope is to stand at the head of the whole family of Christian nations as the heaven-ordained vicar and representative of Christ, dispensing to humanity all the

gifts and graces, not only of heaven but of earth. There is a loftiness, a grandeur in the idea as originating with Hildebrand, the most colossal genius of this period. He aims at nothing less than a vast absolute, visible, spiritual autocracy—an “essential inherent supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal power, as of the soul over the body, as of eternity over time, as of Christ over Caesar, as of God over man.” This power the Roman Church assumed over entire Christendom. The Pope became the Sun in the Christian world, while the Emperor was merely the Moon. The latter derived its splendor from the former. There were two swords, the spiritual and the temporal. Both were in the power of the Church: “the spiritual to be used by the Church, the temporal for the Church.” One sword must be under the other, the temporal under the spiritual. The successor of St. Peter is the vicar of Him to whom belongs “the earth and the fullness thereof.” To him has the Lord given the government not only of the Church but of the whole earth. This idea running through the history of centuries is openly avouched in the well-known Bull “*Unam Sanctam*” of Boniface VIII.

On such a pinnacle of theocratic glory do we find Innocent III., in whom this power of the Church, which had been constantly growing, had now fully culminated. In the exercise of this power the Popes excommunicated sovereigns at will; deposed negligent or rebellious princes; released subjects from their allegiance to rulers; received estates by a cession of rulers as feudal fiefs; set up and overthrew kingdoms at will; held in their own hands the supreme mediation in questions of war and peace; determined contested successions to kingdoms; were chief arbiters of all disputes and took cognizance of the moral acts of rulers, their private life as well as their actions towards their subjects.

Still unsatisfied they encroach more and more upon the political sphere and the rights of the state until they have assumed the exclusive privilege of *Civil punishments, taxes and investitures.*

How could the Papacy thus exercise over nations a supremacy so absolutely illimitable? To gain this power was the work of a long period of history. Centuries were required to build up the papacy itself. It grew out of the episcopate. Ambition of power and even open fraud \* aided its development. So likewise, to extend this power to its utmost limit, until the Pope came to be acknowledged as Head not only of the Church but also of the State, centuries were needed.

The minds of men had been deeply impressed with the paramount necessity of the external unity of the Church. They had come to look upon the Papacy as of Divine appointment, to regard the Pope as the successor of St. Peter. Deeply planted in the heart was a sacred veneration for this successor. To acknowledge his supremacy was part of their creed. To question it, was sin. The rulers of Europe were all members of the Church, taught to regard it with reverence and sacred awe. Thus the Church could rule over them. The Crusades confirmed and greatly strengthened this power, making the Pope the military suzerain of Europe with the power of summoning all Christendom to his standard. But the "climax of this power was the beginning of its fall." It culminated under Innocent III. and at length broke down under Boniface VIII. and his successors, and ended in the revolt of the Reformation.

Where now was the principal defect in this attempt of the Papacy to enforce upon the world a universal Christian Theocracy? Plainly in this, that the idea was in conflict with the spiritual kingdom of grace as set forth by Christ—"My kingdom is not of this world." It is not of this world as to its principle, though "in this world and for this world." As to its essential character it is a spiritual kingdom, designed to exert a purify-

\* Recall the interpolations of papistic passages in the works of Cyprian; the Roman enlargement of the sixth Canon of Nice; the citation of the Sardican Canon under the name and authority of the Nicene Council; and the later notorious pseudo-Isidorian decretals. The popes to be sure were not the original authors of these falsifications, but used them freely and repeatedly for their purpose.—Schaff—Christian Church, vol. II.

ing and sanctifying influence over every order of the world's life, to achieve not with the sword or an arm of flesh, but by spiritual weapons alone, an *internal* victory over earthly powers, until in fulfilment of prophecy—"the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ." The Church, however, never has such power as she assumed during the Middle Ages. The State, as well as the Church, is a necessary institution, and of divine origin and authority. Designed for the temporal, as the Church is for the eternal welfare of man, it should not be deprived of its distinctive character, but be allowed to preserve its identity and independence in its own proper sphere.

When the Church refuses to accord these rights to the State and enters the arena of civil strife, it must bear the consequences. Severely did it atone for the tyranny practised in this period. Involving itself more and more in politics and temporal things, the Papacy fell from the dizzy height to which it had attained, lost its former dignity, and by degrees became thoroughly corrupt and secularized. This is beautifully expressed in the words of the sublime Poet of the Mediæval Catholic Church, the great Ghibelline Dante, himself a Catholic and theoretically attached to the hierarchy, in the 16th Canto of *Purgatorio*—

"Rome, that turned it into good,  
Was wont to boast *two suns*, whose several beams  
Cast light on either way, the world's and God's.  
*One* since hath quenched the other; and the sword  
Is grafted on the crook, and so conjoined  
Each must perforce decline to worse, unawed  
By fear of other. If thou doubt me, mark  
The blade. Each herb is judged of by its seed,  
On this at last conclude. The Church of Rome,  
Mixing two goverments that ill assort,  
Hath missed her footing, fallen into the mire,  
And there herself and burden much defiled."

This temporal rule of the states by the Church eventually broke down. It could not be otherwise. She had gained much of her power by intrigue and force. Gradually losing

sight of her spiritual mission to humanity she assumed an authority and lordship which were antagonistic to the true nature and spirit of the Christian religion. Her theory tended toward an annihilation of nationalities, and the bringing of all into subjection under one common external law. She thus failed to make room for the proper freedom and independence of these different nationalities, and the result was disastrous. For instead of uniting the nations, her polity only sowed discord between them and increased their enmity against each other. In all this, therefore, we recognize a *negative* preparation for the Reformation which, at length, evoked a corresponding *positive* movement.

The polity of the Roman Church had shocked the moral sense of the Teutonic mind, and this produced an estrangement from the Papal See, a crying demand for a reformation of the Church and a yearning for independence.

No less clearly do we see the defect of the Roman polity and the need of a reformation if we view

#### THE HIERARCHY IN RELATION TO ITSELF, OR ITS INTERNAL CONSTITUTION.

During the Middle Ages the true nature of Christianity became gradually misunderstood until it appeared almost entirely as an objective law, a "power from without controlling the whole life of nations and of individuals." It has been called the age of "*Church authority*," of "*Christian legalism*." Mere outward order and rule came to prevail in such way as to destroy all proper independence and freedom. Individual freedom was almost wholly lost in slavish obedience to established, traditional rules and forms. The Church (which had come to mean the clergy alone), in the character of an imposing hierarchical organization came to be regarded as everything for the purpose of individual salvation. In Christ's name and in His stead the Roman hierarchy assumed to itself the triple crown of the kingly, priestly and prophetical offices of Christ upon earth, making everything else subservient to the kingly office; while the masses of people on the other hand were "given over to

serve mechanical forms, which became for them, in fact, no better than dumb idols, and left them without any sense whatever of their proper inheritance in the free, boundless wealth of the Gospel." The result of this was that a *vast gulf of separation came to exist between clergy and laity*. From this was developed two distinct portions of the Church. The one became the "*ecclesia docens*," the teaching Church, and the other "*ecclesia audiens*," the hearing and receiving Church. And the title *Church* began to be applied only to the former; that is, the Church meant the ministry and the ministry only. Thus the Christian world was divided into two castes, distinct, separate and "standing apart as by an irrepealable law of God." In their theory of life, in the whole aim and object of their existence, in their duties and position, they were kept apart by a chasm, broad, deep, impassible. What a change since the first centuries of the Christian Church! In that period of its first love the Church was a society of brethren, now, an absolute monarchy; then, all Christians were priests of the living God (1 Peter 2: 9) with faithful, humble pastors for their guidance, now, a privileged class have usurped the name of Church, claiming special immunities in the sight of the Lord. On the one side stands a tyrannical priesthood, on the other an ignorant populace reduced to a blind, passive submission. The one caste ruled, the other obeyed; the one taught, the other received.

This idea of a particular priesthood, so far removed from the great body of Christians and possessed with special priestly powers and functions, seems gradually to have passed almost unnoticed from the Jewish Synagogue into the Christian Church. That it was an apostasy from the true Gospel of Christ and a Judaizing of Christianity seems clear from a careful study of the New Testament. For, without doubt, we are there taught the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers in such sense as to preclude the Roman idea of a special class entitled to the power of mediation between God and man (1 Peter 2: 5-9). All true Christians are God's clergy, a peculiar people, the heritage of the Lord. (1 Peter 5: 3).

No less clearly, however, does the same word of God recognize the ministerial office in the Church of Christ—an office instituted for the administration of the means of grace, for the spiritual advancement of the mass of believers, and for the purpose of guiding and leading them to immediate intercourse with God. (*Ephes. 4: 11-13*).

There is then a *universal* or general priesthood as well as a *particular* priesthood. In the establishment of the Christian Church the Holy Spirit descended upon both at the same time. The two should be organically united in one body, and when so united, they constitute the Church. Neither one should be ignored in order to emphasize the other. To undervalue the Christian ministry in order to elevate the universal priesthood of believers is an error; but it is just as great an error for the ministry to assume the whole power of the Church, and thus undervalue or ignore the universal priesthood of believers in order to magnify the office of the special priesthood. This latter was the error of the Roman theory. The hierarchy regarded itself as the Church. With a claim of divinely-ordained power, it placed itself between God and the people; claimed to hold in its own hands the power of reconciliation, to act as judge in God's stead, and to retain or remit sins at will. It asserted its own exclusive right to interpret the Holy Scriptures, and to have the power absolutely of dispensing to men the blessings of salvation. Priests claimed to be mediators between God and man. Only through them could be found access to the Father. The people were restricted to the outer court, and there could be no immediate communion of the heart with God Himself.

The consequence was that there came to prevail a dualism which indeed constituted the great defect of the whole Church life of the Middle Ages. This dualism had become so firmly fixed and so deeply rooted that it seemed no longer possible to bridge over the chasm and restore that "mutual influence and mutual relationship between clergy and laity which is necessary to preserve the spiritual health of each." As a na-

tural result, the clergy lost much of their power. The separation between them and the mass of believers became so great that they were unable really to reach the hearts of the people.

It is no difficult matter to see the defect involved in this dualistic nature and character of the polity of the Mediæval Church. It was not simply in the fact that there existed two modes of being, two factorial forces. These meet and are properly balanced in all the creations of God. In every form of embodied life, the plant, the animal and man, we have the individual in the general nature, the one free in the life of the other. So in the universal history of the race as it is unfolded in time, we meet with two factors, the Divine and the human. No less should we expect to meet at all times in Christianity two forces, the Divine and the human, the objective and the subjective, the general and the individual, the principle of authority and the principle of freedom. We find them in this period, but they are not brought into any real inward unity and harmony. Romanism aimed at absorbing the individual in the general, freedom in authority. To realize the proper relation between these two was the problem of history. It pressed more or less for solution all through the Middle Ages, entered into the preparation for the Reformation; yea, it has been said, it was its fundamental cause.

The hierarchical constitution was sadly defective, did violence to the proper freedom of the individual, and became an insufferable tyranny over the souls and minds of men. In this we have a negative preparation for the Reformation, which, in time, gave rise to a positive movement. For when the people awoke to a consciousness of their rightful independence they were powerfully moved to throw off the infamous yoke and free themselves from the fetters of a despotic priesthood.

We have already referred to the sacredness which came to be attached to the *office* of the priesthood and the reverence paid to it by the people. Mysterious influences were thought to connect with the priests in their official acts. By means of the sacrament of ordination the clergy were thought to possess

inalienably the gift of the Holy Spirit. In virtue of their office they were holy, and invested with the treasures of heavenly grace. This magical character of the functions of the ordained led to a separation of the office from the personal moral character of the clergy.

The belief was well-nigh universal that in the hierarchy continued to dwell a mysterious power altogether regardless of the sanctity of their own lives. Frequent murmurs were heard, much fault-finding prevailed at the immorality, the licentiousness of the priests, and public opinion at times held them up to shame and reproach; but they were still priests, successors of the Holy Apostles; their official acts lost not their efficacy, their validity. They still held in their hands the keys absolutely of heaven and hell, and their verdict of absolution or condemnation was accepted as the verdict of God. Even all the acts of the sensual, wicked John XXIII., until his deposal, were regarded as the acts of the successor of St. Peter. But this flagrant incongruity of asserting the Divine power of Christ to be lodged in men so utterly unchristian and openly wicked produced an earnest discussion of the question, whether an official act of the minister was disturbed or invalidated by his immoral life and character? The Church distinguished, and we may say, rightly, between official acts and all others—that official acts did not lose their validity by the character of the minister. Nevertheless, there is an innate feeling in mankind that the two should be organically connected; that there should be a correspondence between the life and character of the individual and the office he holds. Of this, Protestants have a much more fully awakened consciousness than Romanists. During the Middle Ages it was lost sight of or disregarded, and the fearful corruption of the clergy is well known. But the glaring disruption between the moral and ritual elements of religion, between the character of the ministry and their official acts, was destined at last to arouse the indignation of men. The moral sense of mankind, which had been so ruthlessly shocked and so often outraged, was awaken-

ing; and the course of the hierarchy aggravated rather than mitigated the just indignation of the people, when, by the accumulation and abuse of power and wealth, and by the lavish preaching of indulgences by wicked and insolent men, they bade defiance and revealed still more glaringly the great inconsistency between the office they held and their ungodly lives. This abuse entered into the negative preparation for the Reformation, produced a crying want for a better state of things, and gave occasion for the rising of sects before the close of the Mediæval period.

So likewise in the sphere of *dogma* or doctrine we meet a similar abstract dualism—corresponding errors and defects, and in consequence, a like need of reformation. Our limits forbid the development at length of this very extensive part of the negative preparation for the wonderful upheaval of the 16th century. We merely direct attention to it, asserting in a very general way a few of the fundamental defects of the Mediæval system of doctrine. These proceed, as we have already intimated, from the dualistic nature and character of the doctrine then prevalent. It confronts us whether we view it with reference to the *formal aspect* which it assumed, or as regards its *subject-matter*, its *material contents*. The former meets us in the fierce conflict waged with reference to *the relation between faith and knowledge*. Starting, or at least dimly foreshadowed by John Scotus Erigena, it assumed form with Anselm in his "*credo ut intelligam*," was developed through the whole period of Scholasticism, reaching its culmination at last in the five great schoolmen, Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus and William of Ockham. Faith came to be viewed as a mere reception of the doctrine of the Church, which was to be communicated in a simply external way.

According to the practical Scriptural view of faith, the believer with his whole heart and will appropriates the salvation wrought out for him by the incarnation and death of the Son of God. The Saviour, apprehending the Christian, laying hold of his inward spiritual susceptibility and communicating to

him a new life, is in turn apprehended by the faith of the believer, who, in virtue of this inward apprehension, makes an outward confession and produces corresponding fruits. By degrees this view of faith was forgotten or entirely ignored, and it came at last to be regarded in the character of mere blind submission to the outward authority of the Church. From this wrong conception of Faith, this fundamental error resulted of necessity, the unscriptural doctrine of *Justification by Works*. The issue of this was in the end a "general demoralization of the intellectual-consciousness of the Christian world, wide-spread skepticism and doubt, and a perilous exposure of spirit on all sides to the worst forms of irreligious error."

Turning our attention from the form to the *subject-matter of the doctrine* itself, which had been thus outwardly imposed upon the Church, we find it partaking of the same dualistic character. The theory prevailed that man in his original creation did not possess righteousness and holiness as inherent in the very idea of his constitution, but that these were bestowed upon him as an added gift (*donum superadditum*). Thus moral perfection is not that which is required to be realized by the very constitution of his being, but only an additional gift, "magically imposed upon him from without by grace." It taught that baptism was an external gift, and rendered the individual free from the debt of sin and pure before God. But the sinlessness vanished like a dream, and all, after baptism, fell again into sin. This baptismal grace, now lost, could only be restored through a second sacrament—the *sacrament of penance*. Duties were now imposed upon man by which he might not only expiate his guilt and restore himself to innocence, but merit some additional good. Thereupon was invented the infamous system of *indulgences*. The people, unable or unwilling to perform the penances imposed upon them, were urged to consign the burden to the priesthood. But the laborer was worthy of his hire, and the coffers of the Church were lavishly replenished. The clergy usurped the place of God and assumed entire control of the human soul through

life. Nor, even after it departed from the body, was the soul left to the unerring judgment, the boundless mercy of God. The Pope added *purgatory* to his domain, and in that dismal region the priest still held in his hands the doom of the dead. From the wretchedness of the dark abodes beyond the grave men could be delivered only through the aid of indulgences. Thus was God robbed of His glory in providing a free salvation for the human race. Man claimed to deserve what God offered him merely of grace. Divine grace came to be considered as unnecessary, and man, relying upon his own spiritual strength, attempted to "find in himself the salvation which the Gospel brought to him ready wrought out from heaven." In this we find a Pelagianizing element. The true idea of the Deity in relation to the world became vitiated—God and Christ were removed to some far-off transcendental region, and the Romish hierarchy assumed to occupy on earth the place of God. With Him the believer could not come into communion, but only with that governing institution to which the treasures of grace had been given. In thus surrendering to the Church the dispensation of His grace, the effort was made indeed to find in it evidence of God's inestimable love. But as love has to do only with personalities, it is easy to see how this doctrine vitiated the true idea of God in His relation to the human race. In short, the whole system was a mixture of Pelagianism and magic, producing at one time superstition and at another wide-spread unbelief. Of this some Popes themselves were sad examples. The simple Scriptural doctrine of salvation had been encumbered by the Romish clergy with so many human additions and impurities that the mass of people could no longer discern the truth of that word of God which had been made almost "of none effect." Such corruptions and abuses had long existed, constituting a negative preparation for the Reformation. It was only necessary that these corruptions be deeply and widely felt in order for the life of the Church to produce a reaction.

And now, if there existed such a perversion of doctrine and

such a decay of faith, what must have been the *practical life and morality of the age?* The universal voice of mankind in this period speaks of frightful corruption. With the decline of a living faith followed a corresponding declension in the moral and religious life of the people. That there were still found occasional instances of piety and purity of life must be conceded. But toward the close of the Mediæval period the corruption of the Christian world bore a character well nigh universal. And what could we expect from the masses when the abomination stood in holy places? Even the occupants of the Papal chair, becoming more and more devoted to secular and selfish ends, give evidence of the depravity of the Romish court. Falling a prey to the vice of nepotism, the successors of St. Peter lose sight of the more worthy aim of earlier Popes, strive for nothing higher than the aggrandizement of their own families, promote the sale of indulgences and pursue a course that promotes the degradation of the Papacy still deeper in public opinion. The scandalous actions and immoralities of the Popes increase until they reach the lowest depth of debasement under the profligate Borgia who, by bribery, obtained the Pontifical Throne and reigned under the name of Alexander VI. He and his whole family seem to have given themselves over to the power of evil. Polluted by lust and murder, they stand in history as revolting examples of wickedness. Never was there a more glaring contradiction between the lofty requirements of a man's office and the man himself than that exhibited by Alexander VI., the most depraved of all the popes. Nor is the case much better when we look at the clergy in all its ranks. They had almost ceased to be pastors and teachers, and had become temporal lords and rulers. The Bishops were dependent on the Pope, and as a rule purchased their dignities with money, enriching themselves in turn by a like traffic with subordinate offices. Simony was the practice from the Pope down to the humblest officer in the Church. An application for preferment was useless unless accompanied with a certain sum of money. Such simoniacal practices could not

fail to corrupt the whole body of the clergy. Spiritually-minded men would naturally shrink from entering offices thus obtained, while the most worldly characters ready to stoop to the lowest means would gain the highest, most important positions.

To this source of corruption was added another—*the celibacy of the clergy*. Intended, as it was, to increase the vital energy of the priesthood and strengthen the hierarchy, this enforced celibacy became a cause of licentiousness and a fatal weakness of the entire clerical order. Men could not cease to be human. Alongside of celibacy was concubinage and licentiousness in general. An example of wickedness had been set in high places which could not fail to exercise a baneful influence upon the lower clergy. As an instance we need but call to mind the dissoluteness of the Papal Court at Avignon (which we presume no candid Romanist would deny), or the life of that monster of depravity, Henry, Bishop of Liege, whose lust was promiscuous, and whose boast at a public banquet was that "in twenty-two months he had had fourteen children born." "Concubinage," says Matthew of Cracow, Bishop of Worms, "is publicly and formally practiced by the clergy, and their mistresses are as expensively dressed and as respectfully treated as if their connection were not sinful but honorable and praiseworthy." Priests became notorious for their ignorance, debauchery, immorality and covetousness. Century after century was heard the earnest protest not only of such bold spirits of opposition as Huss and Savonarola, but of the purer churchmen themselves, of Bishops, of Cardinals, of Popes. We need but listen to men of high position in the Church and Schools, such as Matthew of Cracow, Peter d'Ailly, John Gerson and John Tritheimius to hear exposed the deep and universal corruption of the priests and pastors of the age. The last named depicts the customs and manners of the clergy in the following words: "Unlettered and rude men wholly destitute of merit rise to the priesthood. No attention is paid to purity of life, a liberal education, or a good conscience. The study of Scripture and learning are totally

neglected by the priests, who prefer occupying themselves with training dogs and birds. Instead of buying books they beget children, and instead of studying, make love to their concubines. They sit with tipplers in the taverns, are addicted to gaming and debauchery, and destitute of the slightest fear of God. They can neither speak nor write Latin, and scarcely know enough of German to explain the Gospels. Nor is it a wonder that the inferior priests are so illiterate and averse to the study of Scripture, considering that in this they have the prelates for a pattern, who are appointed to their offices, not for superiority in learning, but for superior skill in making money. They are blind leaders of the blind, and in place of guiding the people in the paths of righteousness, rather misguide them. Hence they need not be at all surprised that the laity despise them, when "they themselves despise the commandments of Christ." Truly a revolting picture.

Next to the clergy came the Monks and Friars who, with less education and less discipline than the priests, were subjected by their mode of life to greater temptations, more ruinous opportunities. To doubt the corruption of this class likewise would be to discard historical evidence. It is true that the rigid discipline and noble efforts of orders, such as the Carthusian, the Augustinian and the Benedictine produced some austere spirits who remained untainted in the midst of prevailing wickedness. But the great body of monks, it has been said, was "nothing more than the standing army of the absolute Papal power and a mass of intellectual stupidity and moral putrefaction." A member of the Carthusian order, *Jacob von Jüterbock*, himself a model of monastic austerity, exclaims: "Alas, what deadly monsters, hiding the rapacity of wolves beneath the fleece of sheep, are in these days found skulking in the monastic retreats of our orthodox forefathers! They shrink from no kind of sin, and it is a true proverb that what a hardened devil would be afraid to do, a bold and profligate monk will commit without scruple."

If such was the condition of the clergy and monks what must

have been the effects produced upon the ignorant masses of people? To ask the question, is to answer it. Could the clergy, from the highest to the lowest rank, become worldly and frivolous, indulge in debauchery and lust, and the people, who looked to them for guidance, not fall victims to the same sins?

To the wicked example thus placed before them was added a stimulus in the proclamation and sale of indulgences. For, whatever may have been the theory of the hierarchy in regard to this practice, it is evident that from the first it was looked upon by the great body of the people in a very gross and carnal light, as so much pay for the forgiveness of past sins and permission to sin in the future—the sale of eternal salvation for money.

We thus see the utter helplessness that existed in the sphere of life and morality. The moral and religious life of the people swung between extremes. "Rigorous in one direction, it was completely lax in another. It came to no harmony, no inward reconciliation, within itself." A dualism existed here corresponding to that already referred to in the domain of polity and of dogma. This is forcibly expressed by Dr. Dorner in the following words: "Increasing worldliness of the Church, and alongside of it Monasticism; the requirement of strict obedience to the Church, and alongside of it a moral laxity which penetrated even into the sanctuary; a rigorous penitential discipline, and alongside of it indulgences; the asserted vicegerency of God, and investiture with divine power, and alongside of it impotency to pacify the inward pain and unrest even of the simplest and most needy hearts. Life passed from contrition to frivolity, and from frivolity to contrition, lost at last all heart and character, and drifted anchorless and broken to the abyss of inward emptiness and spiritual death. The masses followed the traditions, and many of them remained pious and devoted in spite of the obstacles they had to encounter, but in the centres—yea even in Rome itself there were not wanting those who said 'This fable of Christ has brought us great gain,' and some who,

when they heard of Melancthon's faith in eternal life and the judgment, declared they would esteem him a more modest man if he did not believe such things."

Such were some of the defects, the errors and corruptions of the Romish Church. Behold the religious impotency and misery to which they had reduced the nominally Christian world! And then let us ask, what candid mind can refuse to confess that the Reformation was a necessity for the perpetuity of the true Christian religion? This necessity for it came to be generally acknowledged. Along with this felt need had gone up for ages an urgent *demand* for a reformation. And are we not safe in saying that this very need so universally felt and this crying demand which existed for centuries go very far of themselves to "establish the full historical significance of Protestantism?"

But how was the Reformation to be brought to pass? Temporal princes had tried it and failed. Men of genius like Dante and Petrarch had employed the highest learning to effect it, but without avail. Then came the earnest efforts of the Church itself. In the Councils of Constance and Basle and in the assemblies of Ferrara and Florence faithful, honest attempts were made towards a reformation in head and members. But all ended in utter failure. As Dr. Apple has said: "It was as though the energies which had carried the Church through the wonderful struggle with Mediæval barbarism and won the victory were worn out, and new strength and life had to be infused for the new work of the Modern age. The Roman Catholic Church, the Church of the Middle Ages and of Latin Christendom, after having done the work assigned it, could not be prepared for the new work devolving upon it without passing through an epoch, an epoch, in which the old form of Christianity should be laid aside and a new one arise."

## ART. IX.—THE GLORIFICATION OF THE SON OF MAN.

BY THE EDITOR.

THE mystery of the person of our Lord can never be fully understood by finite reason. He includes in Himself at once the mystery of God and the mystery of man, as well as the mystery of their union in His person. But while the person of Christ cannot be fully explained, yet as the object of faith it must enter also into the reason, and therefore from the beginning of the history of the Church it has been made the subject of investigation and study. This was necessary, in part, in order to define the mystery over against error, but also partly to satisfy faith itself. The early creeds have given statements of the dogma, over against Ebionism, Gnosticism, Nestorianism, Eutychianism, Appollinarianism, and Monophysitism, and later also against Monotheilism. The last creed or definition is the one framed by the Council of Chalcedon, A. D., 451, which is as follows:

“Following the holy fathers, we unanimously teach one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, complete as to His Godhead, and complete as to His manhood; truly God, and truly man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting; consubstantial with the Father as to His Godhead, and consubstantial also with us as to His manhood; like unto us in all things, yet without sin; as to His Godhead begotten of the Father before all worlds, but as to His manhood, in these last days born, for us men and for our salvation, of the Virgin Mary, the mother of God; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, known in (of) two natures, without confusion, without conversion, without severance and without division; the distinction of the natures, being in no wise abolished by their union, but the peculiarity of each nature being maintained, and both concurring in one person and hypostasis. We confess not a Son

divided and sundered into two persons, but one and the same Son, and Only-begotten, and God-Logos, our Lord Jesus Christ, even as the prophets had before proclaimed concerning Him, and He Himself hath taught us, and the symbol of the fathers hath handed down to us."

But it still remained for two following Councils, the Fifth at Constantinople, A. D., 553, and the Sixth, held in the same city A. D., 680, to condemn the Monophysite and Monotheelite sects. These definitions sufficed during the middle ages, but in the period of the Reformation the subject came up again in the controversy between the Lutherans and the Reformed on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and later still in the controversy in the Lutheran Church on the subject of the *Kenosis*, or the humiliation of Christ, as referring to the self-limitation of the divinity in the earthly state of our Lord.

But though the Chalcedon formula is the last definition adopted by the whole church in reference to the person of Christ, yet the subject has been discussed very earnestly in modern times, and there is reason to believe that the Church will yet require more advanced statements in regard to this great mystery. The mere fact that the Lutheran and the Reformed Church are still divided on the subject of the ubiquity of our Lord's glorified humanity, while both claim to hold to the orthodox creeds, is sufficient to show that the old formulas have not exhausted the subject. There are other problems connected with the unity of God, the Trinity, the Atonement, and the Sacraments, which cannot be determined without reference to the person of Christ, yea this is the mystery, we may say, that alone can finally solve all other mysteries.

We present some thoughts in this article, as a contribution to the general subject, on *the Glorification of the Son of Man*.

In the New Testament the titles Son of God and Son of Man are used with discrimination as referring to the person of our Lord. There is reason for this discrimination. The one has reference particularly to His divinity, the other to His humanity. Thus, to give one example, in St. John xi. 4:

"This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the *Son of God* might be glorified thereby," and in St. John xii. 24: "The hour is come that the *Son of Man* should be glorified." In the one case the object of the miracle in the raising of Lazarus was to give to the disciples and the Jews this last greatest evidence of our Lord's divinity, of His being truly the Son of God, while in the other case reference is evidently had to the glorification of the humanity of our Lord, or, we may say, to the glorification of His divine-human person with special reference to His humanity. Let us then endeavor first to state more fully the difference here referred to, and then proceed to consider what is meant by the glorification of the Son of Man and its connection with vital doctrines of the Christian faith.

#### THE GLORIFICATION OF THE SON OF GOD.

One main purpose which our Lord had in view from the beginning of His official life on earth was to exhibit His divine character as the Son of God. He came to reveal the Father who dwelt in Him (John xvii. 6). Beginning with His first miracle in Cana of Galilee, on to the last of His miracles, by His wonderful works and His teaching He showed forth His glory, as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. First of all He sought to awaken faith in the disciples. They were to be the special heralds of the everlasting gospel, the connecting link between Him and the world. Hence the challenge, "Whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." This was the mystery which flesh and blood had not revealed unto him, but the Father in heaven.

The glorification of the Son of God was the Epiphany, as it is called. On the one hand it was testified to from without, in the appearance of the angels to the shepherds, the star and the visit of the magi, and the voice at the Saviour's baptism, on the other hand it was a shining forth from within, as in His appearance in the temple when twelve years old, in the miracle at

Cana, where He manifested forth His glory, and, we may say, in all His wondrous works and His no less wondrous words. In one view everything depends upon men apprehending His divinity. Most essential it was that the disciples should believe on Him. This once secured the revelation would have entrance into the world outside of the person of Christ. Hence the great concern of our Saviour that they should believe on Him and know Him as the Son of God. Beyond this circle the revelation laid hold also of others, of the pious women, and of a multitude also whose faith was more or less external and imperfect.

The test always was, discerning in Him His divine character and mission. Men must recognize in Him, not only a teacher sent from God, a prophet, but the Son and revealer of the Father, in whom the Jews professed to believe. His greatest controversy with the Jews culminated on this point. He claimed to be equal with God, and for this they sought to convict Him of blasphemy. He did not repudiate the charge, but appealed to the Old Testament and His words and works in confirmation of it. Without qualification He said, "I and my Father are one." To Philip He said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

This revelation of God in human form could not then, and cannot now, be apprehended by mere sense or the natural reason. God can be known essentially only through the spirit of man, because He is Spirit, and the human spirit cannot know Him except as it is breathed upon and awakened to new life by the Spirit of God. Hence the challenge here is not primarily to the natural understanding but to the spirit, and all turns upon the question whether men will open their *hearts* to the entrance of God. It is primarily a question of faith or unbelief. It touches first, not so much the logical understanding, but the moral and spiritual nature. It has to do with man's conviction of sin and his sense of the need of righteousness and redemption.

Of course the reason is concerned also. In a certain sense

the reason precedes the activity of the will and lights up the way to faith. The presentation of His claims by our Saviour was according to reason, it was not irrational, nor was it to faith blindly, as though faith could be a mere external communication or depositum. But though reason in one sense precedes faith, yet it will be found that in a deeper sense the will in man also determines the rational nature, so that in the end man thinks as he wills. Especially in all moral questions the moral judgment is guided mainly by the affection or love of the man. Hence to believe in Christ requires primarily an activity of the moral and spiritual nature, though not without the activity also of the rational nature.

We find here now one of the centralities of the Christian faith, viz.: that Jesus is the Son of God. It was the first great dogma settled by the church, over against Ebionism and Arianism. The Nicene Creed gives us the formula that He is of the same substance with the Father. 'No one can hold the true faith whose tongue falters in pronouncing Jesus Christ to be God in the fullest sense of the word. "In Him dwelleth the fullness, *pleroma*, of the Godhead bodily." This very briefly is what we mean by the glorification of the *Son of God*, though, of course this glorification is no less also in the glorification of the Lord's humanity, and there only shines forth in its full brightness. The two cannot be separated, though they may be distinguished.

#### THE GLORIFICATION OF THE SON OF MAN.

We go on now to speak more directly of the glorification of our Lord's humanity and its relation to fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith.

From the beginning the divine in the person of Christ was entering, permeating, and illumining the human. The human was constantly the organ and form of the divine. Every word and work of the Lord on earth was truly human as well as divine. Yet it is evident that the human could not receive and take into itself the divine except in a gradual, progressive way.

In one view, therefore, the Incarnation was a progressive act, brought to its completion only in the glorification of our Lord. Certainly as an infant babe the human could not take in the divine in the same way as the full-grown man. So all through the earthly life of the Lord the divinity was veiled. In His transfiguration He gave a momentary glimpse of the inner glory of His person in the lighting up of the human. But His humanity still remained subject to the ordinary limitations of human life on to the end, except in His miracles, as His walking on the sea, etc.

But now when He comes to the close of His earthly life He speaks of the glorification of the Son of Man. In the 12th chap. of St. John, and the 23d verse *et seq.*, we have narrated the reply given in reference to the visit of the Greeks and their wish to see Jesus. The Saviour says, "The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified." This was to be accomplished first through and in His death. "Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit." His glorification in this form could not take place except through His full, final, victory over the powers of evil, over death and hell. This victory was in part His glorification. So at a still later hour, when Judas was convicted and driven out from the company of the disciples, "Jesus said, now is the *Son of Man* glorified, and God is glorified in Him," (John xiii. 31). The glorification was potentially accomplished already in the purpose of Christ to resist and overcome all evil, even though He had not yet actually passed through His sufferings. In these He actually gained the victory over all man's enemies, so that we may say, even His sufferings and death was a glorification of His humanity. The supernatural strength here exhibited was itself the glory of God, though still veiled from ordinary human sight.

This gives us one view of the meaning of the death of Christ, that it was a victory over sin and the consequences of sin. "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out." Man had fallen under the power of

the devil, he was held bound in chains in the prison house. In order to release him it was necessary that the prince of darkness should be overcome and cast out. Christ asserted His power over evil all through His life, but in His last sufferings and death He especially met and conquered death and him that had the power of death, which was the devil. The early church especially emphasized this view of the death of Christ, carrying it so far as to say that His death was an offering made to Satan. In this view these sufferings and death assume an intensely real character. It was not God, as such, contending against Satan, but it was the man Jesus, struggling in the form of His humanity, against the powers of darkness, not without the aid of course of the divine in Him. The victory was then the glorification of the Son of man.

Then, taking the parable of a grain of wheat falling into the ground and dying, we have another aspect of the death of Christ. The death of the natural is the necessary condition for the resurrection of the new spiritual life. We must acknowledge a difficulty here, it seems to us, in the fact that the death of the enveloping body of the grain of wheat comes in the right normal order as a necessary condition for the movement of the new life in the grain, whereas the death of the natural, in the case of our Lord, was rendered necessary by reason of sin. Without stopping, however, to explain the difficulty, we may see that the general truth is here symbolized, that the mere natural falls away and dies in order that the supernatural may spring up in the sphere of undying life and immortality. Christ entered into the sphere of the natural, not to realize man's destiny in that sphere. This destiny was not attainable in any sense in the sphere of the earthly. The earthly is only the vestibule of the spiritual, the heavenly. The spiritual in man ensheathed in the natural forms of his earthly existence must break through this ensheathment, and take to itself a spiritual body in the heavenly order of existence.

So in the person of our Lord there was the germ of divine life and immortality of which He is the source, which He

brought into our humanity, and which came to its flower and fruition through His death and resurrection from the dead. This mystery was unknown to the Greeks. It includes the general fact of the resurrection for man. It was foolishness to the culture and learning of Athens, when St. Paul afterwards preached it on Mars Hill. Our Lord's death was the planting of the seed of the resurrection unto eternal life for all who believe on His name. "I am the resurrection and the life," He declares to the disconsolate sisters in the presence of the grave of Lazarus. The process here is according to the order of spiritual life, starting in the depths and darkness of the womb in nature, though not originated there, and rising into a new spiritual existence in the spiritual world. As heathenism knows only the supremacy of the natural order, and is ignorant of the necessity of its death, so also it could not, of itself, apprehend the truth of the resurrection. Our Lord's resurrection became once for all the source of the resurrection for all who are joined with Him in His mystical body. In this view His death brought forth much fruit. He rose not for Himself alone, but His resurgent, glorified humanity became the very substance of life and immortality for all redeemed men.

We may now pursue our theme in considering further what is involved in the full glorification of the Son of Man. This opens before us the full mystery of the glorification of our Lord's humanity from the open sepulchre to His ascension to the right hand of God.

After He arose from the dead He said to His disciples, "all power is given unto me in heaven and on earth." This clearly was not merely a resumption of that almighty power which was an attribute of His divinity, and which eternally belonged to Him as the Son of God. Such omnipotence belonged to Him always. Even when on the earth He declared His full equality with the Father. "I and the Father are one." But now He refers to this omnipotence as *given* to Him. It was the reward and fruit of His mediatorial work, His life of perfect obedience and His death upon the cross. It is spoken of as something

conferred upon Him by God. "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, wherefore God hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." (Phil. ii: 5-11). We may quote as referring to His exaltation the words of St. Paul in Eph. i: 15 *et seq.*: "Wherefore, I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers; that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him: the eyes of your understanding being enlightened that ye may know what is the hope of His calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of His power to usward who believe, according to the working of His mighty power which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: And hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be head over all things to the church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all."

These passages, among many others, set forth the nature of the exaltation of our Lord; and while they speak of the person of Christ, yet they must refer to the glorification of His humanity, because this only could it be that was thus exalted, not His divinity as such. Or we may say, it was His person in human form, that form which some theologians tell us belongs

ideally to Him always, that form which he assumed when He became man for us men and for our salvation, and which He retains forever in the heavens. This exaltation, which is sometimes called His mediatorial power and reign, is supreme. "And hath put all things under His feet," that means, if it means anything, that His authority and power are supreme over the whole universe,—angels and archangels, principalities and powers, being subject unto Him—not subject to His divinity or Godhead, as such, for that is so eternally, but subject to Him now in human form. There can be no question here as to the absolute supremacy of His dignity, authority, and power, and these as dwelling in His glorified humanity.

This sets forth the glorification of the Lord as of universal, absolute significance. It is for the whole universe. Without quoting the passage, we refer the reader here to Rev. 4th chap., where our Lord in His glorified humanity is represented as the object of supreme homage and worship. A Protestant commentator says of this: "In a didactical aspect the *song* is expressive of the fact that the effect of Christ's triumph pervades the entire world of spirits on the one hand, as an extension of His glory (Eph. i., Phil. ii.); and on the other hand, it ushers the whole creaturely world into the process of glorification, to be consummated in the *palingenesia*" (Rom. viii). "Their homage is *sevenfold*, in harmony with the holy throng. The worship of the creatures is *fourfold*, in accordance with the number of the world. We have here an antiphonal song of praise from all beings, reminding us of Ps. cxlv."

Let us see now what all this involves. Clearly it implies that we can know and worship Christ only in His human form. Through that, and that only, can He be known to us. The object of worship, as described in the passage above referred to, is, not the eternal Logos as such, but the Word made flesh, now glorified in the heavens. This is plain, that we can know and worship Christ only in His human form. But we cannot stop here. He is the revelation, at the same time, of the Godhead. "In him dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily,"

that is, we think, in human form. We cannot, and we ought not to endeavor to form any conception of the Father, except as He is revealed for us in the Son. "Philip saith unto Him, shew us the Father and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, have I been so long time with thee, Philip, and yet hast thou not known me? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, shew us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me?" In the Middle Ages attempts were made to represent the Father. It was said that if the Son is the image of the Father, then the Father must have a form also like that of the Son. But we would expect no such ignorance and impiety in this age. And yet there are, no doubt, many who think at least of the Father as existing in some way outside of the Son. But this cannot be. The persons of the Trinity, the ontological Trinity, as theologians tell us, are to be thought of as *in* each other, however we may be able to think thus of them. But when it comes to our apprehension of God revealed, there is only one form in which we are to think of Him, and that is the glorified human form of our Lord. Whether this is always done, and how difficult it may be in our devotions, may be ascertained by fixing before us the glorified human form of our Lord, and that only, when we say, "Our Father which art in heaven."

Of course we are not to omit in our thoughts or in our worship that the Fatherhood of God, or the personality of the Father as it is termed in theology; but as to the form of the Father, *that* can come before us, either for faith or thought, only in Christ. May not this be the meaning of those words in St. John xvi. 23, 24? The first of these verses seems to be against what we are presenting, but in the original there is a different word used in the 23d verse from that used in the 24th, meaning, we think, "In that day ye shall have no occasion to question me as now for information, for ye shall know all through the Spirit." Then He goes on to say that hereafter they are to ask, pray to, the Father *in His name*. The name here evidently means Himself as they had come to know Him.

He is the medium of all prayer to the Father, and He is the medium of all answer to prayer from the Father to men.

This being so, we cannot but think of another point here, whether we can answer it or not, viz., this: Is the whole activity of God in relation to the universe now mediated by the glorified Lord, and thus through His humanity? We can answer it at once in the affirmative as far as the Logos nature of Christ is concerned. He is evidently the only revelation of God to the entire universe. "All things were made through Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made." This refers not merely to our earth, but to the universe of worlds, the entire creation of God. The question now arises, Is the entire activity of the Logos now put forth through His glorified humanity?

If this be answered in the affirmative, then it follows that the glorified humanity of our Lord is the form and medium of the activity of the Godhead in relation to the universe, which seems to be the meaning of His words, "all power is given to me in heaven and on earth." The old divines, we know, made a distinction between the essential and the mediatorial kingdom of Christ. Thus, in Dick's Theology, vol. ii., p. 119, we read, "There is a distinction to be observed between His essential and His mediatorial kingdom. The former He always possessed, and since it belongs to Him as God the Creator of all things, He could not lay it aside even during His humiliation. The latter He received when He ascended; for although He had a right to it, when He rose from the dead, and therefore told His disciples, that it was already given to Him, it was upon His entrance into heaven, that He sat down upon His throne. His mediatorial kingdom comprehends power to establish, and govern, and defend, and bestow eternal salvation upon His Church, and power to render all things subservient to its interests. He ought to be considered not only as King of Zion, but as the Lord of the universe. Hence when we say that the world is under the government of God, we should reflect, that properly it is not the Father of whom we speak, ex-

cept in this sense that He always acts in concurrence with the Son ; but that the declaration of our Saviour, that "the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son," is true of the whole administration of affairs. Our Redeemer holds the sceptre, and sways it over angels and men. "He hath put all things under His feet."

Any one who reads this chapter in Dick's Theology, on the exaltation of Christ at the right hand of God, will feel at once how mechanically and externally he treats the whole subject of the Trinity, and how unsatisfactory his whole treatment is. He speaks of the persons of the Trinity continually as being out of each other, and it is hard to resist the thought that his own conception leans much towards tritheism. The same confusion appears in his treatment of the glorified Christ. For instance, he raises the question whether we may rightly worship Christ in His character as Mediator, and answers it by saying that while divines generally answer it in the negative, he thinks the Scriptures clearly teach the affirmative. Thus, as he seems to separate the persons of the Trinity, he seems also to have before his mind something like two Christs, one inferior to the Father, and the other equal to the Father. There is no avoiding this confusion on both points, except by thinking of God and worshiping God as He is revealed to us in His Son our Lord. Out of Christ God is unknowable. "No man hath seen God at any time. The only begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath revealed Him."

One other point we may refer to here for the thinking, without undertaking to solve the question. All theological writers speak of the glorified humanity of Christ, as glorious in majesty, far beyond our comprehension. What are the limits of that human form, now filled with the divine and introduced into the ineffable Trinity? Is there still a gulf of separation between it as finite, and the infinite God? If we ask the question, is the humanity of Christ now limited in power? the difficulty may be seen. He says, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." Does He not exercise this almighty power

through His humanity as the form and organ of His Godhead? If we ask the question, is His knowledge still limited? It is difficult to think this possible. The Lutheran theology gives an answer in their doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum*, but this seems to us to involve a contradiction in terms. It gives infinite attributes to a finite substance, for they maintain that the humanity of Christ is infinite in His state of glory. We do not venture here beyond the decisions of the Church, but it is very clear that the humanity of Christ in its glorification is the adequate organ and form for the divinity of our Lord, and that His majesty and glory must be seen and worshiped only in and through it. There are questions here which the Church formulas do not satisfy. We cannot doubt but that as the person of our Lord is the mystery of all mysteries, and the only source of the knowledge of all mysteries, the Church will yet attain to a deeper insight into the constitution of His person. Just here it is that all divisions in the Church start, and here again they must have their end. If the Lutheran and the Reformed Church were one in reference to the person of Christ, they would soon be united on all other subjects. And the problems, we think, turn mainly on the nature of the glorified humanity of our Lord.

There is one other doctrine connected with the glorified humanity of Christ, concerning which we need to be in no difficulty, viz., the doctrine of the mystical union, and of the believer's partaking of the humanity of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. Here we reach ground which is clear and plain in the teaching of our Reformed Church.

It seems hardly necessary to fortify our remarks on this subject with quotations from Scripture, since these so readily occur. The figure or allegory of the vine and the branches, the passage in the 6th chapter of St. John concerning the bread of life, the figure of the head and the body given by St. Paul, and many others of a like character, all set forth the intimate, vital, union of believers with Christ. "In Christ the love of God resides and rests (*residet et acquiescit patris amor*)

out from Him it issues forth to us, and no one is loved by God outside of Christ. . . . What was in God incomprehensible and hidden, *that God was pleased to discover and make accessible to us in the Redeemer.* The deep secret original well of love which would otherwise remain hidden from us, rises up in the Mediator for us ; it is set before us as a flowing fountain, out of which we are to draw." These sentences are quoted from *Dorner's* statement of Calvin's views on the relation of Christ to His people. We might multiply them easily by direct quotation from Calvin himself. The general truth, that new spiritual life from God flows into the believer through Christ is so plain, however, that it is not necessary to quote either from the Scripture or Calvin to show that it is a doctrine of the Word of God and the Reformed Church. But the following, still from *Dorner*, touches more directly the point under consideration : " Thus the person of Christ is for him (Calvin) the Divine Love itself, manifested and become apprehensible ; and it is not merely the divine nature of Christ which effects salvation, but righteousness and the treasure of salvation resides for us in the humanity of Christ (*in Christi carne residat nobis justitia et salutis materia*)."

The meaning of the 6th chap. of St. John cannot well be misunderstood on this point. " Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood ye have no life in you." This is the general truth that underlies the meaning of the Lord's Supper. It refers not immediately and directly to the form of communion with Christ in the holy supper, but to the general truth, that spiritual life for man flows forth from the humanity of our Lord, for this evidently is what is here meant by His flesh and blood. Hence the necessity is made universal, like that of the new birth itself. This life reaches the believer through the means of grace, the Word and the Sacraments, and is received by faith. In this general sense it is made a necessity for all, whereas in the special mode of receiving it in the Lord's Supper it is essential only for those who are prepared to receive it by conscious faith, that is, for adult believers, not for infant believers.

As the humanity of Christ was necessary for His atoning death, and as in this form He may be said to have given His flesh for the life of the world when He died upon the cross,—when He laid down His life for His sheep,—so also His glorified humanity is the source of new spiritual life, through the Holy Spirit, to those who are redeemed through His death. Zwingli, as we know, emphasized only the former in his doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Over against the Roman doctrine of the Mass, which taught a repetition of the sacrifice on the cross, he maintained that in the Lord's Supper the benefits of the sacrifice on the cross, made once for all, were made over to the believing participant by faith in that offering. Calvin, however, taught in addition to this, that in the Lord's Supper the believer partakes of the glorified humanity of Christ, His real flesh and blood, as having in it the benefits of the one sacrifice offered on the cross. And on this point the Calvinistic Reformed Confessions all utter one voice.

There was indeed a difficulty for the natural understanding in explaining the mystery. If Christ is now in heaven and not upon the earth as to His human nature, how can He be present in this form in the Lord's Supper? Calvin explained that the communion took place in the sphere of the Spirit, by which the believer is lifted up, not of course in space, and enabled thus to partake of the flesh and blood of the ascended Lord. Over against the Lutheran view of the sacrament, which held that His body and blood are locally present in the sacrament, and in such sense that the grace of the sacrament is imprisoned in the outward signs, so that unbelievers, as well as believers, necessarily received the flesh and blood, and that with the natural organs, this explanation of Calvin is certainly to be preferred. The eating and drinking here is a spiritual act, corresponding to the natural act of receiving and eating the natural bread. Faith is the organ for receiving the grace of the sacrament, not the mouth. And the spiritual transaction is not in the sphere of nature, in space, but in the sphere of the supernatural.

But this explanation of Calvin, nevertheless was embarrassed with difficulties and led to much misunderstanding and misrepresentation. Hence while the truth and substance of the Calvinistic view is still maintained as according to Scripture, a better understanding and explanation has been offered in later times. The *spiritual real* presence is conceived of as a dynamic presence, according to which the signs in the sacrament are, not signs of absent grace, but of a grace really present, and imparted to the believer. The earlier confessions are strongest in asserting this, and if there is any difference in phraseology, the later confessions should be explained by the earlier. For instance, the old Scotch confession of 1560 asserts that "by baptism we are ingrafted into Christ," whereas the Westminster confession says that baptism is a sign and seal of being ingrafted into Christ. No one who reads the Reformed confessions can be in doubt as to their meaning on this point. And so far as this doctrine of the mystical presence, as setting forth the union of the believer with Christ, and partaking of His humanity in the Lord's Supper, has been lost sight of among Calvinistic churches, there has been manifestly a falling off from the old Reformed faith. Yet it is true that a large portion of the Presbyterian church, and even a portion of the Lutheran church also, hold to the Zwinglian view of the sacraments. Dr. Hodge, who once argued that Calvin did not teach this view of the sacraments, clearly misrepresented the Calvinistic faith on this point. The *Mystical Presence*, by Dr. J. W. Nevin, and his historical argument in the old "Mercersburg Review," have settled this point once for all. Our Lord is present as to His humanity everywhere in His Church, which is His mystical body, while as to His revealed presence, He is not on earth as He once was present to natural sight, but is in heaven at the right hand of God. An analogy is found in the presence of the Adamic life in all the descendants of our first parents. Adam lives in all his descendants without any confusion or mixture of his individuality with theirs. So our Lord, while He remains separate from and above all His people as to His personality, never-

theless lives in them as to His theanthropic life,—they in Him and He in them. The unionistic school of German theology find here a reconciliation with the Reformed view. The ubiquity of our Lord's humanity is conceived of, not as identical with the omniscience of God, but as holding in the kingdom of grace. And so far we may say the Reformed and the Lutheran view have approached nearer to each other. On the question as to the necessity of faith as the organ for the reception of the grace of the sacrament, the Reformed view must certainly stand.

We have thus endeavored to present the Calvinistic Reformed view of the Lord's Supper, as showing the significance of the glorified humanity of Christ in the life of the believer. This is a vital point in the Calvinistic Reformed confessions. They condemn the view that the bread and wine in the holy Supper are mere empty forms.

In the way of practical application we may also refer to the significance of the glorified humanity of our Lord in reference to the final state of the redeemed.

It is said in the Heidelberg Catechism that the resurrection of Christ is a pledge of the resurrection of believers, that as His body was raised up in power and glory, so the bodies of the saints will be taken up to a state of glory and immortality. But we may extend this application. The glorification of the humanity of Christ, body and soul and spirit indicates the glorious destiny of man. It reveals the capacity of the human for the reception of the divine. We referred in another place in this article to the view of some theologians that humanity is eternal ideally in God. However this may be, when it is said that man was made in the image and likeness of God, it is implied that there is a peculiar adaptedness of man for union with God. It is said of Christ that He is the likeness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person. From this it would follow that man was made in the image of the Logos. Hence there must be a certain peculiar correspondence between the Son of God and the humanity which He assumed into union with His divinity. When He

entered into union with our humanity He came unto His own. Human personality is something relative, which rests in the personality of God as the absolute ground of man's rational and spiritual being.

Hence in the person of Christ, though there was, and is, two natures, there is but one personality. The divine personality is at the same time the personality for the humanity and the divinity united in His person. This shows the relationship between the two; it shows that the human can become the organ and form for the divine.

Now the saints are not united to God, we know, in the same way that the human is united to the divine, in the hypostatic union in the person of Christ. That union is peculiar—unique. But we are told that in their glorification the saints shall be like Christ. "When He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." Redeemed men will be raised up to a height of spiritual existence in which their human nature will be prepared to take in the life of Christ beyond what we can form any conception of here. Who can form any conception of the limits and capacities of reason and will in the case of the redeemed in a state of glory? Christ here is the absolute image. As the divine glorifies the human in His person, so in their finite degree shall redeemed men be organs of the divine truth and the divine love as these flow into them from Christ. "They in me and I in them," our Saviour says. In that state of bliss they shall be indeed a holy temple for the perpetual indwelling of the Lord of Hosts, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

---

#### RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM, newly Translated. *From the Third Edition of the German original. With a notice of the state of the Text and of the chief Versions.*

As the title indicates, this pamphlet gives us a translation into English of the Heidelberg Catechism made from the original German, made by a committee of the General Synod of the Reformed Church of North America. The received English text used by the Reformed Dutch and German Reformed Churches ever since the

English language has gained ascendency among them, is a version not made from the original, but from the Latin and Dutch. All linguistic and historical evidences justify this opinion. The first translation from the original was prepared by the German Reformed Church, and published in 1863, as a part of the tercentenary celebration. Our brothers of the Reformed Dutch Church have now taken the same matter in hand, and in the pamphlet before us give to the public the result of their labors.

Placed in our hands but recently, we have not had time to give it full and thorough study. A partial examination, however, has left a very favorable impression. The committee has gone to the original German, taking the third edition published in 1563, as the standard text, and have reproduced that, without any of the additions found in the Latin version. Besides, like our Tercentenary edition, it uses Anglo-Saxon words, ruling out, as far as may be done, the Latin derivations so abundant in the English version now in use.

These two translations from the German harmonize throughout, though there are some important differences. Some of the variations from our Triglot edition commend themselves to our judgment; for example, those occurring in Questions 69 and 75; but some others do not, such as Q. 12 and Q. 32. We expect to recur to this subject again. Meanwhile we venture the suggestion whether it would not be judicious for these two Reformation Churches, the only denominations in America who recognize the Heidelberg Catechism as their Confession of Faith, to unite in an effort to make *one* English translation, which would be accepted and adopted by both; which might be effected by means of a joint commission appointed by the two General Synods. The end is worthy the time, the labor and the expense which such a united effort would involve. It is manifest that one English version, authorized and approved by the Reformed Church in the United States and the Reformed Church of North America, would have a better and wider influence than the two authorized English versions, differing in many particulars. Both churches having now made the original German a matter of careful investigation, both would be well prepared for such co-operation, and might without much difficulty harmonize on these variations.

We append a few quotations from the succinct and carefully prepared history of the text given in this pamphlet. E. V. G.

#### 1.—THE TEXT.

There were three separate editions of the Catechism, issued by order of Frederick III. in 1563, and a fourth, as part of the Kirchenordnung, in the autumn of the same year. The three editions have the following points in common:

1. Substantially the same title page:

Catechismus Oder Christlicher Underricht, wie der in Kirchen

und Schulen der Churfürstlichen Pfalz getrieben wird, (a Vignette and the Electoral Arms.) Gedruckt in der Churfürstlichen Stad Heydelberg, durch Johannem Mayer, 1563.

2. The preface by the Elector, dated Tuesday, 19, 1563.
3. The first part of the title page forms the heading of the Catechism proper.

4. The questions are not numbered, and there is no division into Lord's day.

5. The Scripture proofs are designated by book and chapter only, and placed in the margin.

6. The division of the Catechism into the three parts is indicated with a few orthographic variations, by the headings:

Der erste Teil. Von des menschen elend.

Der ander Teil. Von des Menschen Erlösung.

Der dritte Teil. Von der Danckbarkeit.

7. The following subdivisions are also printed as heading:

Von Gott dem Vater.

Von Gott dem Son.

Von Gott dem heiligen Geist.

Von den heiligen Sacramenten.

Vom heiligen Tauff.

Vom heiligen Abendmal Jesu Christi.

Vom Gebet

8. All the formularies, such as the chief sentences in the summary of the law, the creed, the commission of baptism, the institution of the Lord's Supper, the commandments and the Lord's prayer, are printed in larger text.

9. At the close of the book these formularies are recapitulated.

*The First Edition.*—Its special characteristics will be best understood further on, by the comparison between it and the second edition. It is mainly distinguished (1) for the entire absence of the 80th question and answer; (2) for the twelve errata given at the close.

The only copy known to be extant is at present in the library of the university at Utrecht. A fac-simile was published at Bonn, in 1864, by Albrecht Wolters, noticed above in the literature.

*The Second Edition.*—How soon this followed the first, there are no data to judge by. Its peculiarities are:

(1.) The partial use of the errata marked in the first edition.

(2.) The substitution of the ordinal text for the cardinal Roman numbers over the commandments.

(3.) Changes in spelling, capitals and case forms, for orthography in German was almost as arbitrary as the English of the same date, and the inflections were not wholly fixed.

(4.) The transposition and variations of the text, e.g., in Q. 85, the first edition has: Wie wird das Hammelreich auff und zugeschlossen?

The second edition has: Wie wird das Himmelreich za und auffgeschlossen?